DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 988	UD 009 147
TITLE	In the Balance; A Review of Equal Educational Opportunity.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.
Pub Date	69
Note	77p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
Descriptors	*Civil Rights, *Compensatory Education, *Educational Planning, *Educational Policy, Educational Practice, Equal Education, Integration Plans, *School Integration, School Segregation, Suburban Schools, Urban Education
Identifiers	Kerner Commission Report, More Effective Schools, New York City

Abstract

The report presents condensed and edited versions of the major addresses presented in Lansing, Michigan, at the 1968 Central States Area Conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education. Dr. M. Chesler's topic is the relevance of the report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission) for urban and suburban education. The relationship of civil rights to education is analyzed by Dr. J. Hannah. Dr. T. Pettigrew discusses the educational effectiveness of school segregation. The problem of segregated educational systems is dealt with by Dr. R. Green. Dr. G. Anrig reviews the program for equal educational opportunities of the U.S. Office of Education. Integration in the Evanston, Illinois, schools is reported by Dr. G. Coffin. Desegregation practices in the Hartford schools are analyzed by Dr. A. Rogers. Dr. G. Jones discusses compensatory education programs as approaches to the problems of the underprivileged. Detroit's compensatory education program is reviewed by Dr. L. Monacel. Al Shanker discusses the More Effective School Plan of New York City. (EM)

09147 E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

in the balance

ED033988

A REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

UD 009 147

Michigan Department Of Education 1969

State Board of Education

	Term Expires
Dr. Peter Oppewall, *President* Grand Rapids	Jan. 1, 1971
Thomas J. Brennan, *Vice President* Dearborn	Jan. 1, 1971
Michael J. Deeb, *Secretary* Detroit	Jan. 1, 1977
James F. O'Neil, *Treasurer* Livonia	Jan. 1, 1975
Dr. Leroy G. Augenstein Holt	Jan. 1, 1975
Marilyn Jean Kelly Detroit	Jan. 1, 1977
Dr. Charles E. Morton Detroit	Jan. 1, 1973
Dr. Edwin L. Novak Flint	Jan. 1, 1973

Dr. Ira Polley, *State Superintendent*
of Public Instruction, Chairman
Member, Ex-Officio

William G. Milliken, Governor
Member, Ex-Officio

ED033988

IN THE BALANCE...

is a review of the major addresses on compensatory education and integration in the schools of America as presented in Lansing, Michigan, at the 1968 Central States Area Conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

FOREWORD

We are pleased to transmit this review of the subject matter presented to the 1968 Central States Conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Equal educational opportunity is our most crucial question. Its companion issue, compensatory education for those who have been denied the schooling or the cultural background to make schooling worthwhile, is also vital.

Approaching these problems at a policy level, with full recognition of their difficulties and their pitfalls, is a major step and it needs to be followed with implementation procedures that are sound, forceful, forward-looking and, above all, effective.

We trust the proceedings reported on here will prove to be a significant move in what we know to be a proper direction.

Ira Polley
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENT

Page

Dr. Mark A. Cheslar
University of Michigan 1

Dr. John A. Hannah
U. S. Civil Rights Commission 19

Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew
Harvard University 25

Dr. Robert L. Green
Michigan State University 35

Dr. Gregory Anrig
U. S. Office of Education 41

Dr. Gregory Coffin
Evanston, Ill., Public Schools 45

Alfred Rogers
Hartford, Conn., Board of Education 49

Dr. George W. Jones
National Education Association. 57

Dr. Louis Monacel
Detroit Public Schools 63

Al Shanker
New York City Federation of Teachers 69

INTRODUCTION

The 1968 Central States Area Conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education dealt in part with compensatory education and integration in our schools. The major addresses presented at this conference drew clearly and starkly the problems we face in our search to provide true equal educational opportunity for all youth.

They are published here, condensed and edited from the tape recorded proceedings of the conference, in the hope that the information and successful model programs presented will be of significant use in meeting the grave challenge with which we are confronted.

Black or white, rich or poor, the youth of America today must have an education that fills not only the traditional learning function of our schools, but provides the environment for reconcilement of a nation that is now torn and divided by the diversity of its populace.

According to the data supplied in these addresses, we are a nation divided. According to the evaluation of our efforts in integration and compensatory education presented by these speakers, we are falling short of the mark. Our action must be swift and decisive. The test of democracy and the "one nation indivisible" that we have so proudly proclaimed is in the balance.

Peter Oppewall, President
State Board of Education

Dr. Oppewall is the Vice-President of the Central States Area, National Association of State Boards of Education, and served as the chairman of the Central Area States Conference, which was held in Lansing, Michigan, in the spring of 1968

HOW WE LIVE WHILE WE MAKE THE TURN

Dr. Mark A. Cheslar
Project Director, The Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

It is my pleasure to be here this morning and to pick up the challenge of talking with you about the relevance of portions of the report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders and the Kerner Commission Report for urban and suburban education. I have subtitled our conversation "How Do We Live Until We Make the Turn" to focus on the central dilemma that I see us all being in, in major school systems across the nation. Essentially, what do we do until we can secure some kind of just educational system? Given that we are not going to resolve the variety of dilemmas and problems that are reported in the Kerner Commission Report, what kinds of things can we do? What kinds of problems do we have to face up to until we get to that pleasant state of affairs when we will have resolved the contradictions in our society, dilemmas of our institutions, and the frailties of our skills?

Essentially, I want to do a diagnostic job. More than anything else I would like to talk about some of the conditions of urban and suburban education that are briefly touched upon in the Kerner Commission Report that have major implications for what kinds of alternatives we can imagine for the future.

I want to talk directly and realistically about what some of the issues seem to me to be. A good deal of my time right now is spent in going around to school systems and working directly with urban and suburban systems that are in the throes of dealing with the kinds of conflicts that are noted in the commission report. In a sense, in a number of junior and senior high schools across this country today, we have minor riots, revolts, rebellions, insurrections that in some ways mirror the kinds of explosions that we experienced in our major cities last summer. If one were to take a good, hard look at some of the issues in junior and senior high schools, I think we could reflectively learn quite a bit about some of the issues in the major cities and some of the implications for the future.

In the area of education, the commission report should be clearer, I think, and easier to go to work on than in probably any other chapter of the report itself. And primarily, that is true because we have been fortunate enough in the area of education to have been prepared for this report by two other excellent compendia of materials, namely the Report on the Equality of Educational Opportunity, the Coleman Report, and the Racial Isolation in the Schools Report prepared by the United States Commission on Civil Rights. I am not sure that the Kerner Commission Report adds anything aside from a sense of urgency and militancy about the issues that are presented therein.

Much of what the Kerner Commission Report says I think we already know, either from our own experience or from these other two reports. It says, for instance, that the tragedy of the public schools right now is that they do not perform the traditional American purpose invested in public schools, namely to overcome diversions in environmental background, to overcome the differences in skill, motivation, concern and interest that grow out of youngsters coming from different families and different parts of the country. Secondly, it says that both managers and consumers of education -- principals, teachers and students themselves and their parents -- seem to be highly alienated from the educational process itself and from the structures of education in major urban areas. Thirdly, it says that many students drop out of school, kind of an index, a terminal index of degrees of alienation. It also says that many facilities are still highly segregated. Of course that begs the question. Our experience has been that even if facilities are desegregated, the desegregation is by no means a sufficient condition for quality learning. It may be a necessary condition, but desegregation in and by itself in no way guarantees greater learning, improved learning, better attitudes about inter-racial affairs and the like. There are some important intermediate steps between desegregation and quality education for a loving school system and harmonious interracial relations that we really need to tackle and neither the Coleman, Racial Isolation or Kerner Commission Reports really focus in on them.

The report also makes clear that in urban systems teachers are less experienced and have less credentials, and the report would seem to imply that that is bad. The evidence does not validate the notion that less-credentialed teachers and less-experienced teachers are any worse for youngsters than older and more experienced, highly credentialized, certified and accredited teachers. It is just not clear. I am not saying that we ought to populate our schools with inexperienced young teachers. I do think that will be a meaningful experiment to try, because it is just not at all clear that teachers with a great deal of accreditation and experience are any more effective in dealing with youngsters or with their colleagues or with their parents than are less experienced teachers. But to the extent that placing less-experienced and less-accredited teachers in urban systems is an illustration of central administrative unconcern and the lack of creative leadership in staffing schools, it truly reflects a continuation of either segregated or racially biased policies, for the report also said that teachers who are working in the urban school system, particularly with lower class and Negro youngsters, have negative attitudes toward their students. That does not only mean that white teachers have negative attitudes toward Negro students, but it also means that Negro middle-class teachers have negative attitudes toward Negro lower-class youngsters and that white middle-class teachers have many negative attitudes toward white lower-class youngsters. These attitudes reflect themselves in an assumption that youngsters really cannot and will not learn, an assumption that the most important thing to do in a classroom is to maintain control and order and that it really is not worthwhile to invest the energy in a creative type of management of internal affairs or the creative management of the learning process itself.

It is also quite clear, although the report does not really mention this, that youngsters know how their teachers feel about them. Youngsters are almost completely unambiguous about being able to tell just how their teachers feel about them. So, it is not just that teachers have a negative attitude, but that teachers communicate these attitudes in ways that are very clear. Youngsters understand that message and begin to program their own motivation, their own learning goals and their own investment in the classroom on the basis of an anticipated low evaluation and an anticipated rejection from the teacher.

The report notes that there are more psychologically disturbed youngsters in the central city schools, that the public systems in those areas are overcrowded and that they have the oldest and poorest equipment in these urban centers. The Racial Isolation Report and the Coleman Report suggest the degree of overcrowdedness and quality of facilities may not make any difference in terms of learning. I think that is not clear. It may make a tremendous difference, but the range in the crowdedness of schools that the Coleman Report looks at may not be sufficient to really highlight the issue.

Finally, the Kerner Commission Report notes that very often the curriculum of central city schools is irrelevant to the needs and concerns of youngsters, that suburbs are getting more money quicker than our central cities and that teachers are largely out of touch with the communities in which they are teaching and with the youngsters and the families of youngsters with whom they are dealing. These issues are not about to be resolved today or this year. Neither will the rest of the lists in the report on problems in employment, housing, political systems and the like. None of them are going to be resolved very quickly, which brings me to justification again of my major concern of what kinds of things do we do to keep us alive, to keep school systems operating, keep youngsters learning at some pace of learning until we can reorganize our entire society and the major educational systems that serve it.

The schools are particularly vulnerable on these kinds of lists because by and large teachers, like policemen, and like merchants if there are white merchants left in ghetto areas, represent the major points of interchange, the major roll-ins for actions between the Negro community and representatives of the white community. So, it is really a kind of tragedy the way the burden of our entire society's failure to deal with racial systems falls on the back of policemen and teachers, who are just part of that society. There is no evidence to suggest that teachers, policemen and white merchants in ghettos harbor any more dreadful feelings about racial issues than do the rest of us. But reality is that they are in a situation where their racial feelings and attitudes come into direct contact with people who are aggrieved, maltreated and often brutalized, particularly in the schools, of course. That is why there seems to me to be an essential obligation to talk about the police in some other forum than for teachers, not because they are any worse, not because they are any more evil creatures than anyone else, but because they are on the firing line. Our concern ought to be as much to protect and prepare them for that firing line responsibility as to decry and demean their skills in meeting these obligations.

Quite recently, one might say over the past six months, we have seen in high schools throughout the nation the beginnings of center-stage activity, the beginnings of boycotts, strikes, and inter-racial violence that presage the kinds of urban dramas that we can get ourselves ready to expect this summer. High schools in communities across this nation are experiencing serious inter-racial and inter-generational conflicts, and in a rapidly growing number of communities, white students and black students, black students and white educators or just plain students and educators have been engaging in disruptive, sometimes violent and certainly nonproductive forms of conflict. Even where violent outbursts have not occurred, it is clear that there is serious alienation from learning and mutual distrust across racial and generational lines that characterize both contact, interaction and learning attempts in the schools. Often the roots of these explosive tensions are in the school itself, are in the curriculum, internal management and classroom operation. At other times, these tensions are responsive to or promoted by factors in the local or national community. Sometimes the tensions grow right out of the rest of the discussion of urban ills that are in the Kerner Commission Report. Ofttimes there are local out-of-school agitators or conflict escalators who work in trying to promote a realistic confrontation or a dramatic confrontation across racial, generational and class lines.

Whatever the specific form or cause of such conflict in each case, the number and severity of such explosions is fast creating a secondary national crisis. I would like to think that the first crisis is the fact of inequality itself, but the problem of not being able to manage that or work in that with any degree of productive or creative conflict resolution is creating a secondary conflict all by itself. Now I say that it is both inter-racial and inter-generational conflict because it is happening in all-black schools, it is happening in all-white schools and it is happening in mixed racial schools. When we have a racially mixed school, the conflict most often takes the form of inter-racial fighting. One of the reasons for that, of course, is that if youngsters are going to fight, one of the clearest lines of fights that have been laid down for them by the embracing environment is the fight along racial lines, particularly when an administration or a group of teachers present themselves as being invulnerable to negotiation or communication. Then youngsters very often fight it out amongst themselves.

Certainly many of these issues are also present in elementary schools but because of time, I would just as soon not talk about elementary schools. The issues are more overt, are more traumatic and clearer in secondary schools. It is easier to keep the lid on elementary schools. It is easier for school administrators to get parents to exercise control over youngsters in elementary schools, and so these conflicts show themselves in rather covert forms of apathy, withdrawal, low achievement, sickness or emotional illness in elementary school youngsters. Nowadays secondary school youngsters are expressing their feelings in more overt, more troublesome and often times more brutal forms in the high school.

There seem to be four or five major issues that are being floated up for our consideration in troubled high schools and junior high schools right now. One is the kinds of conflicts that appear to be between groups of students. This may be inter-racial groups; it may be inter-class groups. These conflicts are born perhaps out of frustration with the administration of the school. They are also born out of ignorance of each other. Across racial lines, they are born out of the maintained distance between Negro and white communities. They are maintained by the fact that very often junior and senior high school represent the first opportunity that youngsters of different races get to be anywhere near one another. Up to then they have been taught and grown up in a system that has facilitated their being separate. One of the things that is bound to happen in a high school is youngsters have to experiment with new ways of not being separate. How do you manage your first instance of some kind of newly intimate or newly inter-active situation? Very often the youngsters just do not know how to manage it even if they wanted to. Very seldom have school systems gone out of their way to prepare youngsters for any part of inter-racial association. The youngsters come in with ignorance, with fear, with mistrust, with lack of skill of knowing how to manage the newly threatening situation in which they are located. Certainly the projection of parental mythology and stories of what is going on in the cities as relayed by the press help create for white and Negro youngsters alike an atmosphere, an aura of tension, of threat and of potential calamity.

A second major focus is between students and teachers or students and administrators. Very often this is across racial lines because in most racially mixed schools we have more Negroes or a higher percentage of Negroes in a student body than we have teachers on a faculty so that very often one of the things we have is a situation of Negro youngsters confronting and trying to deal with white teachers and administrators. Very often the issue is not inter-racial but is inter-generational, where youngsters are trying to deal with the establishment and maintenance of adult controls. In a school I visited recently one of the most dramatic messages was stated by the former and present presidents of the student council of the school. The former president said she had just quit because she could not get any cooperation from students and none of the teachers would listen to her. The present president said she was about to quit because the teachers and administrators maintained a puppet control over the student council and did not permit it to be a meaningful activity. The principal and faculty advisor made most of the decisions about how things would be. When youngsters confronted their faculty advisor and principal with the reality that they felt, they were told, "That's the way it is at school board meetings. This is the thing we face with the arbitrary role of local school board and administration, so you might as well learn how it feels right now." The youngsters really were not quite satisfied with that answer, and I suspect, many principals would not be satisfied with that answer either. Many youngsters feel that the length of their skirt and their hair is their "bag," their problem, and that no one else ought to be messing around with that kind of an issue. I am not out to debate the rightness and wrongness of controls around skirts and hair lengths and hem lengths and tightnesses and loosenesses, but merely to state that youngsters generally are quite concerned with these kinds of regulations as an instance of adult control over too many portions of their lives.

Another issue that is often floated up in student-teacher relationships is what we can either call student defiance or adult disrespect. When I started, I started meeting a lot with teachers. When I met with elementary and secondary school teachers in urban areas they said, "Among the most important issues for us is how to deal with the defiant student." I finally went around and talked to students. I said, "What are the major issues for you?" And they said, "The most important problem for us is how to deal with teachers who don't respect us." Very often these things go right up tight together, and very often the teacher who has experienced student defiance is the teacher whose students are experiencing teacher disrespect. Students and teachers both constantly complain of this veritable seesaw.

One of the ways of inquiring into the problem that I have found helpful is to ask teachers, "Why does defiance bother you?" When we try to get some understanding of what the real issues are here when we talk about something like defiance, most of the time it boils down to three or four basic kinds of answers. One, "Defiance is wrong. Students should behave in a certain way with respect to authority, with respect to teachers. Because I'm a teacher, I have a due of certain kinds of respect, and it is morally wrong, wrong on the element of values, for youngsters to behave in any different way." A second major explanation is, "If one youngster is defiant, it sets a bad example for the kind of behavior that is to be allowed for other youngsters. So I must respond to defiance with a great deal of energy to make sure that it doesn't become kind of a 'domino theory' of class relations. If one student is defiant, all others will get to be defiant." The third one is, "Defiance makes me feel that I have lost control in the classroom, and it is important for my emotional security and for my learning values for youngsters that I do have control over what is going on in the classroom." And fourthly, "Defiance is intolerable because it makes me feel incompetent. Because if a student is defiant, it means that I haven't really reached out and established a rapport with him. That's important to me. So his defiance of me is evidence that I've lost him. I would much rather he be scared and quiet because I don't know then that I've lost him." Now these are teacher's words: "Much rather be scared and quiet because I don't know I've lost him instead of acting out the defiance which causes me a great deal of pain and guilt around my being able to act out my own values."

I think if we stop dealing with defiance and instead deal with these kinds of explanations of what the triggers are, we will much more easily be able to get students and youngsters into some kind of collaborative posture. Because values around courtesy and behavior, data around the "domino theory" of bad examples, reality about what happens when you lose control and the problems of respecting each other's feelings of competence or incompetence, are things that we can program for learning in the classroom. We can manage some kind of conversation about them. Too often defiance or dirty language is the red flag that generates a whole host of repressive activities without adequately explaining what the dynamic forces are that are at work. I must say that another issue that was just served up to me recently was that teachers evidence that disrespect of students by the way that they cannot keep confidential materials confidential and they "blab about whatever they hear."

A third major focus of conflict is teacher-teacher relationships. Negro and white teachers in most high schools complained about the lack of conversation, communication and sharing that exists among them. Teachers at all schools suffer from a lack of professionally relevant discussions of what they are doing and how they are doing it. But, in schools where faculties are mixed, most of the time I hear evidence of there being some rather racially segregated lines along which people talk to one another, and principals and administrators do not take any serious leadership to help confront and break down these lines.

Fourthly, there are teacher-administrator relationships where many teachers feel that school administrators attempt to block all change involved in placing teachers, principals and coaches in schools on the basis of racial concern. Whereas now it may be derigueur to have a Negro teacher or two in a suburban white school, in very few systems is there a Negro coach in a white school or are there Negro principals in a white school. Negro principals and coaches are generally reserved for Negro schools on the basis that they can command better respect in those places and it is unlikely to upset other communities and the like. Very often in talking about how youngsters perceive teachers or how teachers perceive administrators, it seems to us that the perceptions are not at all congruent with the facts of the matter. Very often a school administrator can come down to a faculty meeting and bang out the facts of where teachers are located, about how equally the races are distributed, about what a good percentage of Negro teachers "we have in the system and in white schools." This is strangely unconvincing to the teachers, just as a discussion of teacher goodwill, is strangely unconvincing to students.

So there are two issues here. One is what is the reality of the factual material, and the second is what kind of new forms of debate, discussion, collaboration and trust are necessary between teachers and students or administrators and teachers so that people can believe some of the facts they are being told. The perception of discrimination, the perception of prejudice, is a different issue, but as important an issue, as the reality of those facts of life.

I would like to illustrate by playing some taped excerpts from discussions amongst high school students, teachers, and administrators. Some excerpts are from confrontations where youngsters are in meetings with teachers and administrators and others are offhand discussions among teachers and/or students. I will introduce each excerpt as it appears.

The first comment represents a youngster's feelings that if teachers and administrators had thought ahead things could have happened differently. She is speaking directly to a school administrator in a public meeting.

> GIRL: If you had really been concerned. . . now you're supposed to be an adult man who can accept all kinds of criticism, and we're nothing but teenagers, and so you should be able to accept our criticism on an adult level. Okay, number one, when they had riots in Watts and Chicago this previous summer, before we started school in September, you know that we were an integrated school with Negroes; you also knew that we would probably feel the way those teenagers felt then. Or you should have known. I felt that you should take each school in your district as a personal. . ., like a child, and analyze their problems that would probably arise in September. If you had analyzed the problems and looked at those riots and saw the causes, then maybe in September you would have been better adjusted, and it wouldn't have took you by surprise, and you would have been able to handle the situation better than you could have the way you handled it then.

We asked Negro and white youngsters to talk together about the kinds of issues and problems in their school, or among themselves, that seem to be reflected in boycotts, strikes, and interracial violence or fighting.

> INTERVIEWER: You know, I think all the rest is heresay. I would like to get you folks' opinion on where you see the problems and the issues. And I think this is where we can be productive.

BOY: Well, we have to take it with sides first. It broke out with Negro and white, right? I don't know how the white kids do it cause I'm not one of them. But I know that the Negroes feel that they're being deprived. And that's enough to get you mad enough to fight.

INTERVIEWER: Deprived of what?

BOY: Well, they're being low-rated. You know, discriminated upon.

INTERVIEWER: In terms of not getting certain things, quality, what? You're not getting the right courses?

BOY: No, the courses are the same.

INTERVIEWER: Okay, so where is the discrimination?

BOY: The teachers.

GIRL: You can walk into a room and feel when you're not wanted.

BOY: The discipline problems are wrong. They'll punish the Negroes greatly and let the white man get away with everything. And that's not right. You can disagree with it, but you'll get your turn later on. Now, a Negro will come into class, and he comes late. He gets an after-school appointment, which is right because he has no business coming late. And when the white boy comes into class and don't get one, that's not right. . .

* * *

INTERVIEWER: How do teachers look at students. What do they think about them?

BOY: Well, the way that we felt, and I got the same impression from other kids, that the teachers and the administration here look down at us. We are supposed to give them respect because they are a teacher. But they don't give us respect as students. Now, like I'm a greaser, I dress with a leather coat, pointed shoes and knit shirts; and his skin, he's black. So they have prejudice against us. The greaser has a reputation as being a dummy, hanging on the corner with a cigarette hanging out of his mouth, and in nine out of ten cases, this isn't true at all.

BOY: A Negro is just not accepted here.

INTERVIEWER: We're talking about the faculty?

BOY: Yeah, they look down on us.

BOY: And the climbers wear tight levis, sweat socks, loafers. They are, you know, all the brains. This is what the faculty takes as brains, you know. And these people they treat the teacher as though the teacher is a king or something. "You

> surely look nice today, teacher" and all this. Greasers and Negroes just don't do it, and since we won't do what they want, what most people term is "grippin em" or something like this; they won't do it, so the teachers don't like it.

The general character of these comments are also found in the recent governmental reports and scientific studies noted earlier in this paper. What the youngsters on this tape do not know yet is that the climbers feel that they are just floating through a system that has little relevance or meaning; but they are pretty much able to sit through it, be patient, cool it, until they get to college. Sooner or later these several groups may get together and discuss their common grievances.

> STUDENT: I'd like to say that one of the things our group discussed was on mistrusting the faculty. Because when the kids went in there to talk, into the auditorium, they were in there to help solve the problem. And first Doc says to take your I.D. card and we'll excuse you from class by the name on the I.D. card. So everybody gave their I.D. cards and they signed the paper. Now, they're sending a letter to your parents. And your parents have to come back and your parents have to sign a paper. And this is mistrust cause you didn't say that when the kids were there.
>
> ADMINISTRATOR: Can I respond now to that?

The superintendent is about to respond and say why he did that, but what occurs is a double bind. You can understand the superintendent's position very clearly and sympathize with what he wanted to do; but it's also abundantly clear that he broke his word to the students. I have nothing but sympathy for both parties in this example. They just move themselves into a double bind.

> ADMINISTRATOR: Now another part of the issue, I think, is that there was a great responsibility involved in what was happening there. And I had to exercise the responsibility which every one of your parents expects me to exercise; namely, to assure as best I can the health and safety of the children in the school.
>
> BOY: And lie to the children while we were in there. That's just what you did.
>
> ADMINISTRATOR: No, see, I don't agree with that. . .
>
> GIRL: We're in this school to learn. And my mother said, and I talked to her about this, that. . . when you go up there. . . and I haven't ever done anything, I don't have a record for anything at this school. . . you go up there and you say I promise not to do this, or you bring your parent in, or write a note, that you're admitting to something you've never done. I was in there because I was concerned. I'm not involved in it, I'm not a discipline person and all that. When you're in there you're concerned and then you go up and have to consent to something that you haven't done. What is that? What kind

> of a solution is that? Bring your parents up. All the kids in there were supposed to be problem childs. I'm not a problem child, at home, in school or anywhere else. And I don't feel that it's right for me to bring my parents up there. And I went up there and I was trying to get it straight; _______ said to me that he would check my name off the list. That it is not fair. And a lot of kids went up there and said, "That's my name." He'd say, "Well, what do you have to say?" And they say, "Okay, whatever you say." Now, what is that? That's no promise. Those hundred students that went up there. What is that? They did not raise their right hand and put the other one on the Bible, etc., whatever you do, and say, "I swear to God I will not cause any more trouble," and then they could have been lying also. That's no kind of solution. Those same hundred people can get back into the school Monday and those are the kids that can still start a riot. And with these kids going to the lockers; these kids are going to hear about that. That's going to make them angry. They could still start a riot. They're not solving anything. You have to get to the point; you can't evade the issue; you have to understand, you have to want to . . .

One of the things that is clear is that youngsters and administrators and teachers are in some places caught into intolerable situations where they have mutually conflicting interests and responsibilities at stake. The human waste and tragedy is not just that they're caught in that bind; the greater tragedy is that their history together has so divided them that they can no longer rationally explain and adapt their positions to one another.

Why was violence a response to the kinds of conditions that the various studies and reports talked about?

> BOY: The problem of this school is the colored kids were all up in rebellion against the administration, and the white kids were all up in rebellion against the administration. And they wanted to talk and they wanted some action from last September's disturbances. But they never got a thing; we never got anything; nothing was ever done. And so it just started up again. And I guess now after they had a little trouble, we're finally getting. . . somebody's listening to us.
>
> INTERVIEWER: Do you agree with this?
>
> BOY: Yes, I agree. It's just the point that all the fighting wasn't because of any prejudice against each group. It was just because it was the only means we could take towards being able to talk to the administration. And like you said, now we're making progress.

* * *

> BOY: Like if I went to fighting him, as a means to accomplishing something, it wouldn't be because of prejudice; not because I don't like him because he's white, not because I don't want to

> go to school with white people, or anything like that. But it's just that I can't go directly to Mr. ________. If I want to speak to him, why I'd be turned around before I even got to his office. And the same with other groups, and the same with white boys, so my only means is to cause trouble. And I can only do that by fighting and then I can get to talk to him. Not I, personally, but as a group, Negroes.

The Negro youngster is saying, and the white youngster had just said, that all the fighting wasn't really because of racial prejudice among students. It was because it was the only way to get the administration's attention. That raises a very interesting question. I am not sure I believe those youngsters. A great deal of evidence indicates the reverse. But I do believe that once Negro and white youngsters believe what they had just said, we have the opportunity to teach new lessons of interracial collaboration and new ways of positive living together across racial lines. Even though I believe that part of the interracial fighting was racially motivated, and not just frustration with the administration's posture, the collaborative pattern that these warring youngsters are now in presents a marvelous opportunity for teaching and learning about interracial living.

One of the most important issues raised in these schools was the nature of students' strategy and concern. Did students know why they disrupted school? Were their actions deliberate or spontaneous? Did they want to take over, to be heard, to make noise, or what? Here are some expressions of students' and teachers' feelings on such issues.

> MALE TEACHER: It's just not clear to me. I don't think students know what they want.
>
> FEMALE TEACHER: I think I know what they want. They want to run things.
>
> MALE TEACHER: Well, it just seems to me that we're saying more and more that the students don't know what they want, and they're just not clear what it is they're after.

* * *

> GIRL: They say we want to take over, but that's not true. We just want to have a little bit of voice in what goes on around here.
>
> BOY: Yeah, they don't want us to have any voice in anything around here.

* * *

> BOY: We had a problem that confronted everybody in our group. We sat down and we talked, and we decided that the problem was that the students had no way of communicating with the administration on a level that they would be heard and really listened to. So they did the only thing they knew how to do; this was to riot, to get attention; or revolt is a better word, to get attention. They revolted so that the administration

would pay some attention to them. And it isn't as the newspapers and the TV has said: "200 Negroes, 2,000 Negroes, a certain number of Negroes did this." Negroes can't riot by themselves. It was both Negroes and Caucasians, the majority Negroes and greasers. They rioted because they couldn't get any kind of representation. But now the students aren't thinking about rioting with themselves any more. It's just like everybody's turned and looked at the administration. Because the administration seems to have lied, seems to have put things in such a way that they can't get out of the fix that they're in. So the students are now saying to all the rest of the administrators: "What are you going to do now?" We have tried in all the ways possible to communicate with you. We can't petition, we can't come down to your office and say "Do" or not say "Do this." We don't want to command, because we want a strong administration, which most of us think we don't have. We want to talk to you, but we haven't thus far been listened to. The only time you listen to us is when we riot. So what other method do you want us to use?

GIRL: We don't want any more violence. I mean I've been hurt, and a lot of people have been hurt. And I don't think its necessary.

* * *

FEMALE TEACHER: I don't think we define democracy right--I think we should teach our children that even though we have democracy it doesn't mean that everybody has the final say-so. Somewhere along the way there has to be somebody who has the final say-so, and I think we can teach our students that well by starting out young and giving them a little bit of freedom. Then they don't get everything at once.

MALE TEACHER: But these people do have a feeling of democracy and how do we respond to it? Are we going to make them equals, peers, or do we keep them on the bottom, you know, out of sight?

A youngster I talked to in another city, a girl, was absolutely livid about the newspaper's reports of school disturbances as terrible riots. She said that at the University nearby, they just had a terrible kind of fuss. It was worse than what happened at the high schools, and it was reported as the annual spring frolic. She said she wrote letters to the editor, went down and saw the newspaper editor, and nothing happened. That disastrous press reporting, she said, helped the white community to continue to see racially desegregated and largely Negro urban schools as not worthwhile investing in, or sending youngsters to, or putting money into, or treating with anything other than control and withdrawal.

* * *

INTERVIEWER: What's going to happen in this meeting?

BOY: All hell's going to be raised. Today, in our meetings, the white kids and the colored kids, we got together now.

Well, actually it happened last Wednesday at the meeting when again he stabbed us both in the back again like he did last September.

INTERVIEWER: There was some communication between you two when that happened?

BOY: Yes, sir.

INTERVIEWER: Whereabouts, outside?

BOY: Well, in the morning, we had been fighting. But by the end of that meeting, we were standing together. We were fighting against _______. That's how quickly it happened. In just a couple of hours we were back together, unified in one student body. And that's the way it is now, only more so. And it's going to be white and black, green, purple, all different colored people and all different dressed people fighting against him and his administration.

As these youngsters reflect upon it, they're suggesting that the outbreaks were not just a spontaneous, random letting off of steam, nor were they momentary responses to immediate frustrations. Rather, the disruptions were seen as the last ways possible to open up communication with the local authorities and with the central administration.

We asked the youngsters and some faculty members in various schools to specify some of the responses or programs that would make sense now. As they respond, you can understand some of the barriers or problems, as well as promises, in the implementation of new policies and ideas.

BOY: In our group we had a solution. We decided that the colored and white should pick a leader and make a list of all the grievances in each group. And then we'll take this to the faculty and we'll give them a certain amount of time, you know, long enough so that they can decide on these. And it'll be, you know, we're not figuring we can get everything we want. But we're not going to have them say that we're kids and we don't know what we want. I guess if we don't get what we want, we thought that if we could get all of these kids together, that we'll boycott the school.

MALE TEACHER: Well, I'm tired after spending all day here at the school.

MALE TEACHER: Me, too.

FEMALE TEACHER: You know, I've been thinking about the workshop Saturday, and a lot of the ideas were pretty good. I really would like to try something with my kids. But you know, I looked at my students today and I thought I can't try those with my students.

MALE TEACHER: Yeah, me either. All that's fine to talk about, but I don't know how we can get it done here in this school.

FEMALE TEACHER: You know, once I tried letting them have a discussion group.

MALE TEACHER: A discussion group, oh boy.

FEMALE TEACHER: Oh, the kids got so excited. They made all this noise, and I got a note from the central office telling me to cut down the noise.

MALE TEACHER: Typical.

MALE TEACHER: That's the way it is. You start giving students any kind of freedom and you get the administration right down on your neck.

MALE TEACHER: We just can't get the kind of support we need from that . . . .

* * *

MALE TEACHER: Well, one way would be to go at it in faculty meetings, but when do we have the chance to talk about anything like this at faculty meetings? Matter of fact, when do we get even a chance to talk at all?

MALE TEACHER: That comes after 3:00.

MALE TEACHER: Well, seems to me that everybody's talking about freedom, but what about faculty freedom?

FEMALE TEACHER: That comes after 3:00, too.

MALE TEACHER: Comes after 3:00, huh. Okay.

It is clear, from these comments, that much work needs to be done on improving the organization and utilization of faculty resources. Faculties that have no time and energy to prepare for or reflect upon their own growth and mutual support cannot possibly respond innovatively to student concerns.

MALE TEACHER: Or at a faculty meeting, simply as students.

FEMALE TEACHER: I think they should be at every faculty meeting.

FEMALE TEACHER: There are times when there are issues to be discussed when the kids don't have anything to say about. Now, well, it might be good for one or two students to sit in on a certain type of faculty meeting, but there are, you know, times when we have things that are just teachers' business.

* * *

GIRL: Maybe that was my problem in the beginning, confronting Dr. ________, who backed down on what he has proposed for the future. I think one thing should be mentioned--that from now

> on, when rules are set, they should be kept, and they should be enforced. And they should be enforced equally. For instance, if we had all been suspended that day, there might have been a lot of trouble. But we all would have respected, and we all would have had to conform. And I think this business with simple little things like coming late to class, if a student is late to class, he's to be treated fairly. And if we definitely knew that there were certain rules that have to be followed, and there was no question at all, you follow these rules, or else, it would be a lot easier to conform to because we would know exactly where we stood, there would be none of this, "Are we here, or what's happening?"

The above represents a student's desperate plea for some clear structure and for rules that are enforceable. Very often rules are made that are simply so stringent or vague so as to be unenforceable. And that gets students and administrators into a great deal of confusion and trouble. Here are some final comments about some resources that must be developed and used in new ways.

> INTERVIEWER: To get what? What do you hope to get this afternoon?
>
> BOY: Things that are written right here on the wall. Most of them are all the same. Like Negroes want equal opportunity along with the climbers. The same thing with the greasers here. We need trust.
>
> BOY: That's very important; you need trust. It's gotten to the point, don't nobody trust anybody. And that's all the student body's got to look up to. You know, if you've got a problem, you're supposed to take it to the administration. If you feel that your counselor couldn't handle it, you know, you go to the administration. And when you can't do that, what can you do?

Let me try to sum up some of these remarks. I think one of the critical questions is what kind of things can happen and what has to happen to deal with the data in the report, the kinds of feelings that are on this tape? One absolutely crucial response that must be made, and we have to gear ourselves up to making it immediately, involves a development and assistance of a crisis-intervention team or series of teams in various parts of the country who can respond immediately and vigorously to situations that are starting to blow. This does not mean a team of people who will cap a flaming well or put a lid on realistic and appropriate conflicts, but people who can help turn that conflict from noncreative and nonproductive to creative and productive ways of listening to each other and talking with one another, searching for compromise.

It does not matter what else happens. The kinds of problems and the kinds of dilemmas that our cities and our schools are in are not going to get results this summer or next summer, and we need to move quickly beyond the primitive models that are now being used, namely, the model of overpowering and repressing with suspension and the utilization of policemen in schools. By the way, the utilization of policemen in schools seems to do more to strip teachers of power than any amount of student defiance. Gradually, what seems to happen is that more and more the policemen are called upon to perform everybody's function, from checking the washrooms to counseling to "assistant principaling" and the like. We have got to go beyond surrendering schools to chaos, and we have got to go beyond ignoring issues by denying that there are problems or telling youngsters to fight off school property. That is one step that seems to me absolutely crucial, that is to develop crisis intervention teams whom everyone can trust to be honest and real, not just purveyors of administrative cooling out or additors to rebel flamings.

Beyond this, there are new designs for the structure and conduct of urban school systems such as compensatory education, new kinds of desegregation, educational parks, school-community procedures, the building of model schools.

On a shorter range and more immediate level, we also need to be thinking about new models of designing ways of living together in schools. That means the utilization of store-front schools, of freedom school credits both inside and outside the school. It means the use of para-, sub-, extra-professionals, whatever we call them, in the school system. It indeed means to forget about some of our fears about the credentializing process. It means we need to experiment with parents running schools, with a group of community-agency people advising or even supplanting principals and assistant principals in the management of new ways to deal with the introduction of community issues into schools and the relevance and reaching out of schools into dramatic community issues. We need to experiment with real attempts at student power, with going beyond meaningless and irrelevant kinds of puppet student councils to giving youngsters a chance to be heard and to be responsible for actual decision-making and for some authority in schools. These youngsters that we heard on tape are primarily asking for communication. As soon as they get that, they should be asking for some degree of authority and responsibility. I see no reason why we should not experiment with providing just that. I do not think that means, nor are they asking, for the school to be turned over to them. I think that means they need to be involved in some collaborative way of making decisions about school policies where they get an experience and a learning opportunity to test out some part of representative politics, and where teachers and administrators likewise have to begin to deal with the school as a representative political entity, not a highly institutionalized, highly controlled hospital model.

Moreover, it means that we ought to think about new roles in the school system itself, such as a student ombudsman or a vice-principal for reform -- people who would be freed from traditional duties to walk around, to mess around, to find conflict and trouble where it is, not to hide it but to bring it up where it can be seen and dealt with so that long-smoldering anxieties, conflicts and tensions do not stay hidden, repressed and denied until they burst forth in some other kinds of violence. Given the lack of mistrust that now exists between adults and students and often across racial lines, we ought to create new kinds of roles populated by students as well as adults who can perform these kinds of functions for schools and for school systems as well.

There need to be local task forces created to really dig into some of the ways that we can generate problem-solving, confrontation and conflict management across racial lines, across class lines and, moreover, across those very mysterious and hidden age lines. In high schools it seems to me that the inter-age barriers are more hidden and less talked about than the cross-racial lines themselves. In order to do this, it means that people who are in the positions of power and responsibility need to be thinking not only of instituting and encouraging designs such as this, but taking those necessary preparatory steps so that youngsters who move into desegregated schools know what they are getting into, have some preparation for dealing with one another, have some preparation for exercising freedom and decision-making powers, so that teachers have some experience and some notion of what inter-racial living is like, what inter-generational confrontation is going to be like, in order to manage their own insecurities, lacks of skill and concerns about what the future is going to be.

Similar kinds of preparation are necessary for administrators and local school board people. We are talking here about changes in attitude, but not attitudes alone. We are also talking here about changes in courage level and changes in skills to do the things with which many of us agree and which reports encourage we ought to be doing. Very often the resistance to implementing some of the kinds of issues or programs that we have talked about here and some of the kinds of dilemmas noted are not just attitudinal resistance, but a problem in the lack of skills in knowing how to go about doing some of the short-range things that have to be done.

I do not mean to be either naive or panaceatic about some of these things, but it is very clear to me that the state of affairs we are currently in absolutely demands that we do some testing of alternative ways of building schools, of managing schools, and of dealing openly with crises that occur.

Dr. John A. Hannah
Chairman, U. S. Civil Rights Commission
President, Michigan State University

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you to discuss briefly civil rights and its relationship to education. I am not going to say much that will be new or different from what you have read or heard many times before. All I hope is to set the stage for the definitive discussion on your program this afternoon and tomorrow.

It has become increasingly clear that as education in the past has been responsible in part for social conditions today, so education will play a key role in any action to correct those conditions in the future. Furthermore, it is my personal conviction that the most meaningful action in the field of civil rights will be taken at the local community level, and you who are here play a key role in determining the course and the pattern of education in the local schools both directly and indirectly.

If my more than ten years as Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights have taught me anything, it is that the final solution will have to be worked out locally, that whether they will be worked out depends on the willingness of local leaders all over America to work together in a spirit of cooperation, mutual trust and shared responsibility.

I am not suggesting that the federal government and the state governments nave no parts to play and that everything can be left to initiative and decision at the local level. For no one who understands the structure of the American government would make that assumption. It is self-evident that there are levels of responsibility with federal, state, county and local government being called upon to act in their own areas of influence and responsibility. But what is not so evident is that there is also an order of succession in responsibility.

First, I want to make clear that responsibility does not and cannot end with the agencies of government. It runs to many kinds of organizations and to the individual citizen too. If our theory of democratic government is to retain its virility, then every American, whether he holds public office or not, must participate in the solution of what is surely the most pressing and most demanding domestic problem of our times. No domestic problems confronting our country today are more complex, more frustrating at times, more important, more demanding of solutions than the problems that we group under the general heading of civil rights.

It would help if each of us would develop our own personal answers to this question: "What specifically am I talking about when I say civil rights? What specifically are those rights?" You will have your own answer. But here is mine: Civil rights are the rights of all citizens, all persons, and they are extended to all equally. Perhaps they should be called human rights, for civil rights has a cold legalistic tone about it. When you say human rights it brings the matter to the level of each of us, and we begin to think of others as human beings like ourselves, with the same ambition, hopes, fears and aspirations that we all entertain -- human beings entitled to the same respect and dignity that others enjoy. These rights certainly include an equal opportunity to develop through education the native talents of every person so that he may if he wishes be the ablest and best person he is capable of becoming. This is important for the benefit of each individual and for the improvement of the total society, for the one resource we cannot afford to squander is the underdeveloped potential of all our people.

After this educational opportunity is provided, there must be an equal opportunity for full employment to utilize the potential of every person to contribute fully to our society and to equal economic rewards to the individual for the same amount of work and the same quality. Now, enjoying those economic rewards, every citizen must have an equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of his social contribution, an opportunity to live in a good home in a decent community with all of the advantages and privileges that you and I collect for ourselves and our families.

Finally, the last and most important human right is the right to be accepted as a dignified human being regardless of color or race or religion. The most difficult handicap the Negro American faces is the requirement that he demonstrate his decency before he is fully accepted. The rest of us are accepted as decent human beings until we demonstrate that we are not. Too many Americans are ready and willing to acknowledge that there are good and decent and fully acceptable people of all colors, but they then unconsciously require a personal demonstration of goodness and decency before being willing to accord equal recognition to them.

The Commission on Civil Rights was created by Congress in 1957 on the recommendation of President Eisenhower. The basic legislation requires that it be an independent bi-partisan agency, reporting directly to the President and the Congress. The first charter of the commission suggests the state of confusion about the facts prevalent at the time of its passage. You will remember this was a great long-drawn out discussion in the Congress, much acrimony, much more heat than light and finally, about all they could agree upon in the way of civil rights legislation, and the first significant legislation since the Civil War, was the creation of this commission.

The commission was given the responsibility to investigate complaints that citizens were being deprived of their rights to vote or have their votes counted by reason of their race, color, religion or national origin. It was given the responsibility to appraise public policies relating to equal protection of the laws in such areas as education, housing, employment, the administration of justice and the use of public facilities and transportation. Finally, it was required to report the facts of violations and abuse with recommendations for correction, if there were abuses that were found, and that these corrections were to be made directly to the President and the Congress. The Commission on Civil Rights was given authority to investigate, report and recommend but not to take any action on its own.

This was at a time when intelligent people still argued as to whether there was in fact racial discrimination in America. Many contended that discrimination was a myth, not a fact. Many doubted in 1957 that any federal agency with authority only to investigate, report and recommend, but not to act or to enforce, could make much impact on the troubled civil rights situation. Today, more than 10 years later, there is no longer any serious dispute about what the facts are. There is plenty of argument about what should be done to correct violations and abuses, but little or none about the facts. The credit for this constructive change in atmosphere is largely due to the work of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. That may not sound very modest but I am sure it is a fact.

Every year since the commission was established in 1957, it has published at least one report summarizing information developed in the course of the year, making specific recommendations to the President and the Congress. The recommendations have been based in part on testimony taken in hearings, in part on information developed through the commission staff, through investigation, research and, in part, through information supplied by volunteer advisory committees to the commission now functioning in all of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The commission's history covers the decade of the greatest activity in the civil rights movement. Ten years is not a very long time, but perhaps it is long enough to give us a fair basis for assessment of progress. Risking the danger that always attends historical assessment of close range, it can be suggested that in the years since 1957, the federal government has re-examined and restated the rules under which we are going to operate in the area of civil rights. It has reasserted the traditional American belief in the equality of man. It has set in motion powerful machinery to bring about the practical realization of our idealistic concepts. It has acted to insure that its own practices and procedures do not impede, but rather stimulate progress toward these goals. Some states, including Michigan, have followed suit at the state level.

In these turbulent years, the federal government has played a role it has long avoided but could not honorably escape. When we talk about civil rights we talk about the rights of all citizens, and we look to the Constitution, the Supreme Court, the Congress and the Chief Executive to define and protect the rights to which all of us are entitled as American citizens. The federal government has now redefined those rights and has made it abundantly clear that the civil rights acts and related laws are going to be enforced. It has served ample notice that when federal funds are expended, they are going to be expended without discrimination among citizens. Race and color and creed or nationality are not to count against any citizen's eligibility to share in the benefit of federal programs. It is certainly true that this is only the beginning. It is only the basic framework, and it may be too soon to say, but it is certainly not too soon to ask whether we have not reached a memorable point in this great social readjustment. It is not too soon to ask whether we have not reached the point at which the federal government having pointed the way begins to shift the burden of responsibility to others. It is now the responsibility of state and local governments and private agencies and organizations as well -- social associations, labor unions, business and industry, schools and churches -- to bring their policies and practices into line.

If you believe, as I do, that the final solution to the civil rights problems depends to a very large extent on local initiative and determination, there is no comfort in that thought. A great deal of drudgery will be involved and infinite patience, courage, good sense and good will be demanded of all of us. It is much easier to make policy than to devise a workable system for putting it into effect. With due respect for the role of the federal government, all of us should look forward to the time when Washington agencies are less prominent on the civil rights scene and state and local agencies and organizations come to the fore. Such a development would indicate that the American people have accepted and endorsed the principle of equality of citizenship and turned their efforts and attention to the task of making that philosophical concept a working, living reality in their home communities.

Looking forward to that day, let us attempt to put our difficulties into some kind of perspective. First, we should recognize the situation today is not entirely one of our own creation. Each generation has inherited the problem from the one before. What is distressingly clear is that each successive generation has inherited a larger accumulation of difficulties because of lack of corrective action in earlier years. It is only in our time that the accumulation deficit resulting from generations of failure to take corrective action has reached the critical state, the point of the explosions that have marred the national scene in the recent past. It is our lot that the necessity or the opportunity to set things aright has fallen to us at this time, and then we must realize that we are attempting to make a tremendous social readjustment, not in isolation, but at a time of social and political revolution in many parts of the world. As a prominent banker pointed out recently, political power is in the hands of the millions in the underdeveloped nations today. Hunger now has access to political power, and poverty with political power lifts its voice articulate and without apology. So it is in the world and so it is in America. What we do is being done in the powerful spotlight of world attention.

Then, we should keep in mind that many of the final answers to the nagging questions with which we are beset, will be hammered out in the cities. The majority of Americans live in the cities, and wealth and economic power are centered in the cities. Jobs and opportunities are most plentiful in the cities. The peculiar conditions of urban life, the difficulties of housing and health and education which are the major components of the total problem, and more and more the aspirations of those who are demanding their full civil rights are being defined in political, social and economic, but mostly economic, terms. Jobs and opportunity for advancement are the prizes most eagerly sought, and it is in the cities that they are sought most consistently.

Certainly we know more today than we did in 1957 about the attitudes and the aspirations of those concerned, and we are less likely to indulge in sweeping generalizations and lofty declarations or to hope for quick and easy solutions. For one of the things we know, for example, is that the people concerned tend to view their problems in terms of their personal experiences in their own neighborhoods and communities, not on the national, state, or area scale.

As evidence I submit a recent report of the Commission on Civil Rights to the Congress and the President titled "A Time to Listen - A Time to Act." It is subtitled "Voices from the Ghettos of the Nation's Cities." It is a compilation of significant excerpts from testimony taken in a series of hearings held over a two-year period by the commission itself and by state advisory committees in eleven states. It is above all a heart-rending call for help for those trapped in their environment, in their ignorance, poverty and hunger, with ominous undertones of defeat, despair, frustration and desperation. The point I want to make is the complaints are not against governors and Presidents, legislatures and congressmen, but against local government, against local police, against local bankers, against local schools, against local social and welfare agencies, against local merchants, against local landlords. If there is any promise in this litany of despair, it is that the problems of civil rights have been brought down from the lofty levels of federal and state legislation to the home town level where the ordinary American citizen can and must deal with them. Plainly it is indeed a time for all of us to listen and for all of us to act.

It would be presumptuous for me to attempt to tell you how to deal with the knotty problems of schools in the inner city, even if I were qualified to do so. They are your responsibility and the solutions will have to be worked out under conditions peculiar to your states and your cities. But perhaps the study, conducted over a period of 15 months by the Commission on Civil Rights, under the direction of Dr. Thomas Pettigrew, will be helpful. The major conclusion was that Negro children suffer serious harm when their education takes place in racially segregated schools, whatever the cause of that segregation may be, and there is evidence that children of other minority groups such as the Mexican Americans and the Puerto Ricans, American Indian children, suffer similar harms. A corollary finding was that disadvantaged students need to be in school with advantaged children, and vice versa, if schools are to do the job society expects them to do.

Because the commission has come down so heavily on the side of integrated schools, something must be said about those who under the standard of black power now stridently argue for segregation in all phases of American life, including education. This movement has still not yet developed nor manifested itself sufficiently for us to appraise it fully or fairly, but it is already evident that it has potential both for good and for ill. It will be good if it generates pride and aspiration among Negroes and encourages them to think in constructive terms of what they themselves can do to improve their stations in life and their relations with other segments of society. But it will be bad if it promotes and seeks to enforce self-segregation and rejects totally what the majority of Americans still believe, and that is that all races and religions can be accommodated within American society. Some of the movement's more radical leaders have rejected the counsel and support of whites of every kind and of their own Negro leaders and of those others who have worked honestly and faithfully in the Negro cause.

It will be good if it causes Americans to reappraise the magnificant contributions to the building of our country by men and women with black skins and gives them due credit for what they have done, what they are doing and what they can do. But it will be bad if it deliberately sets blacks against whites in constant confrontation, for that is the course that can lead only to defeat after involving all of us in what could be a struggle too dreadful to contemplate. It will be bad if it judges any proposal for settling differences not on the basis of whether it will benefit the black, but whether it will hurt the white. A key role in determining how to deal most effectively with this movement must rest with Negro leadership.

Meanwhile, we must exercise the patience we have asked and expected and demanded of Negroes for too many years. We must intensify our efforts to identify and to understand the true needs and rightful expectations of the American Negro. We must accept the fact that workable solutions to our problems will require the investment of huge sums of public money, possibly even to the point of requiring some personal sacrifice on the part of all of us, and the relegating of other desirable programs to lower priority status. We must steel ourselves to an untiring effort to revise and remodel our social system, including our educational system, so that all Americans can find honorable places in it and be proud to be citizens of a nation that offers equal opportunity to every citizen. Finally, please consider what Thomas Jefferson said about the need for a system of public education in our country in this quote written long ago: "The object is to bring into action that mass of talents which lies buried in poverty for want of means to develop it." You and I believe schools can provide the means. Now we must prove it and that is your responsibility.

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF RACIAL SEGREGATION OF THE SCHOOLS

Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew
Associate Prof. of Social Psychology, Harvard University, Advisory
Committee on Race and Education, U. S. Civil Rights Commission

I would like to address my remarks in particular around the work done in racial isolation of the public schools. I would like to begin by pointing out its implications as evidence for the chief conclusion of the recently issued National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder Report, the so-called Kerner Commission. The chief conclusion, as you know, is that we have in America one nation divisible. Not one nation indivisible. We have growing, two nations. If this is not the America we want, we have to start doing something and doing something fast about changing the basic structure of American society.

It is my belief that there is no more important institution that needs restructuring in this effort than public education. First, to quote from the commission report, "Racial isolation in the schools is intense whether the cities are large or small, whether the proportion of Negro enrollment is large or small, whether they are located North or South." This then is the two nations to which the Kerner Commission refers.

We have essentially two types of school systems in America now, and it is getting worse. The percentage of Negro children in America and the percentage of white children in America in overwhelmingly Negro or white schools, respectively, is greater today than in 1954 at the time of the Supreme Court decision against de jure segregation. For 15 selected metropolitan areas, our largest areas, including Detroit here in Michigan, 79 percent of non-white public school enrollment was in central city schools, while 68 percent of white enrollment was suburban. There is then intense segregation within central cities as well as between suburbs and central cities, and it is growing steadily worse. In Cincinnati, for instance, in 1950, 7 out of 10 elementary school Negroes attended predominately Negro schools. By 1965, 9 out of 10 did so. This is in spite of the fact that Negro elementary school enrollment in Cincinnati over those 15 years doubled -- Negro elementary school children in predominately Negro schools tripled. And Cincinnati is not atypical of American central cities all over the country, including the central cities, of course, in your states.

I will list four causes, only one of which is the cause which is commonly given in the mass media. We are told in the mass media that the cause is de facto segregation and is due to the Wallaces and the Hickses. I do not know if all of you are familiar with Mrs. Hicks. She is our own in Boston, our own Bull Conner. You have your own in your own areas. We are told it is the Hickses and Wallaces in American life who have political power and have used it to carefully misplace schools, to resist all possible and effective racial change in schools. There is obvious truth to this. It is true they have not exactly made things easy. On the other hand, I argue rather that they are a very minor cause of the major problem. If they were the only cause, our problem would be much less severe than it is.

The basic cause is demographic. Negro Americans are more and more living in central cities of America; white Americans, more and more living in the suburbs. But notice they are all living in metropolitan areas. If you listen to the Joe Alsops, apostles of segregationists' doom, you will think that we are running out of whites in America. Or for that matter, if you are in central cities, you might think we are. But we are not. We are not even running out of them in metropolitan areas. The percentage of white Americans and Negro Americans living in metropolitan areas is almost precisely the same, about two thirds of each group. It is not that they are not in the same areas. It is where they are in those areas -- that is whites in the suburbs and Negro Americans in the central cities -- and these trends are rapidly increasing. That, I believe, to be the basic cause of de facto segregation.

The second cause is the way we organize our schools. Take a step back and look at it -- 27,000 different school systems, school districts in the United States. It is absurd. Not even the richest country in the world can set up 27,000 effective school systems and we have. We used to have, just a decade ago, 56,000 school districts. In other words, consolidation has actually decreased the number by more than half, but that consolidation is almost entirely in rural areas. If you have that kind of school districting and you have the racial demography of our country, you will have de facto segregation of schools even if we did not have a Wallace or Hicks or Willis phenomenon in our midst and even if we did not have segregation within school districts, which, of course, we do have.

The third cause is the role that private schools wittingly or unwittingly play in this development. This, of course, is primarily, though not entirely, the role of parochial schools, Roman Catholic schools, Only 7 percent of Negro Americans are Roman Catholics. Thereby, the larger the parochial system in any given city, the larger the number and percentage of white children of school age will be drawn out of the school population, and therefore, the greater the de facto school segregation in the public schools in that area. This is really a distinct problem in the particular cities where there are not only large Roman Catholic populations but large Roman Catholic parochial systems. In St. Louis, for instance, approximately two out of five white children of school age in central city St. Louis attend parochial schools. We are the same percentage in Boston. In Philadelphia, it is over 60 percent. Philadelphia schools are now 60 percent Negro public schools, even though Negroes are a minority of the population of Philadelphia. This is not to say this is the witting policy of the Roman Catholic church. It is to say it is an effect of parochial schools.

Fourth, but only fourth, is the phenomenon that I have already alluded to -- the one that gets the most attention -- the phenomenon of Hicks and Willis and Wallace. Now what does this lead to? In 1965 the best, latest figures we have, interpolating from the Coleman report, 65 percent, in other words two out of three of all the Negro students in a public school's first grade, were in 90 and 100 percent Negro schools -- overwhelmingly Negro schools, twothirds in the first grade. By the twelfth grade, one half were in 90-100 percent schools in 1965. The segregation is most intense, then, in the early grades. They are the most important grades for both Negro and white children to experience integration. Therefore, our segregation is greatest at the most important level.

Or if you chose another definition of segregation of predominately Negro schools, seven out of eight of all Negro students in the first grade, American public schools, are in predominately Negro schools. Two thirds of all Negro students in public 12th grade are in predominately Negro schools. White segregation is even more intense than Negro segregation. In 1965, of both the first and twelfth grades in public schools of America 80 percent of white children were in 90 to 100 percent white schools.

Now, what are the effects? Research in this area is extremely difficult to do. I do not want to imply that the commission has done definitive research in this; nor has anybody else. I do believe it is the best yet and we cannot wait for the data to come in 30 or 40 years from now when social science has more adequate methodology. We have to go on what we know best now, and that evidence, I feel strongly argues for negative effects of segregated schools on both Negro American children and white American children. I do not believe that integration is something for Negro Americans. Nor would I argue that it is something for white Americans. It is something for American society. It is important incidently, to make a distinction in the matter between desegregation and intergration. Integration is the goal. This is not something you do paternalistically because it is a nice thing or moral thing. I think moral reasons are the strongest reasons, but there are many others.

The Coleman Report, the second largest study ever taken in American Education, shows the primary cause of achievement of children in American public schools, all children -- white, Negro and the other ethnic groups, no matter what the class or region--is their family social class. Then what is the primary school cause of their achievement? That is the social-class climate of the student body of their school. In other words, children of all backgrounds, races, creeds, and religions do better in middle-class schools. A Negro child will do better in an all-Negro predominately middle-class school in verbal achievement than the same child will do in a predominately lower-class school. This is a part of integration as such. This is to say then that it is the contact with middle-class children which makes the difference.

I want to point out that this steps on a lot of people's toes, but it is not so different from a lot of things we know in another vein -- that is that children learn from children, not from teachers primarily. As parents we all know that we lose them at around 12 years of age to the peer group, never to regain them. And indeed Coleman shows that the effects of the peer group, the effects of social-class climate of the school, are most important at the higher grade levels. This finding has been misinterpreted, I am afraid, by a lot of people.

First, you can attack it on the grounds that the verbal achievement scores are middle-class tests and you do better from the middle-class schools. That is what they train you for. I am sympathetic to the people who criticize tests for having come out of psychology. I am a social psychologist. I do not like to be called a psychologist. When I come under psychology, I take part of the blame for the over-interpretation of the testing, and I think psychologists oversold their bill of goods. So I am sympathetic with the general type of criticism made of tests. But I am not sympathetic with the idea of doing away with them altogether or forgetting what the tests are really all about. Whether the tests measure the child this way or whether the school systems measure the child this way, society, rightly or wrongly, will measure them that way when they are in the labor force or attempt to enter the labor force. To do away with testing is to sweep the problem under the rug. Those children will be tested sometime, and the inadequacies will come out sooner or later to the detriment of the children involved.

I think the social-class finding already argues for the necessity of racially integrated schools, simply because there are not enough middle-class Negroes around to provide predominant middle-class familiar for Negro children. From any way you want to measure -- occupation, income, education -- about one in four Negro Americans is presently middle-class. That is a great difference from 1940 when approximately one in twenty, about 5 percent, of Negro America was middle-class to today, about 25 percent. That compares with about 60 percent of white America. This means, apart from racial considerations, if you were going to provide predominately middle-class familiar for disadvantaged Negro children and disadvantaged white children, you would have to have racial integration, just on class grounds alone. This comes from the Coleman Report.

The Commission of Civil Rights Report of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools tried to go the next step and ask: Is there also a racial component involved here, which affects white and Negro children? We believe that the evidence argues that there is, in addition to the social-class variable, the social class of the school, measured by the education of the parents of all children of a given school. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not saying that the racial variable is more important than social class in the school. It is quite clear this is not the case. It is the social class of the school which is the important variable. But we believe that there is an additional racial factor. We think it is worth by the 12th-grade level a better grade, up to two grades, worth of achievement for Negro American children. That is not an insignificant achievement difference. And at some levels, particularly for disadvantaged Negro children that grade or grade and one-half may be the difference between functional illiteracy and literacy -- enough to enter effectively into the labor force were discrimination finally removed.

Is this just something for Negro American achievement? I do not believe it is. I believe in fact that the argument around integration has been too much on achievement. I think it is important, as I have already said about testing, because of the labor market decisions that will inevitably affect the children later in their lives. But I believe the most important arguments for integration are at the level of the ability learned by both white and Negro children in integrated settings to get along with one another. I believe it is the only way to prevent yet another generation of American bigots. We have had one generation after another of white bigots. We have now our Negro bigots. I must say the cause of their bigotry is somewhat more understandable from a somewhat different phenomenon. It is, nevertheless, bigotry and dangerous to the society. The only way we know to put a halt to this effectively in the long term is integrated schooling.

Mere mix is not the point. You can have living hells that are desegregated. They are living hells for Negro and white children. Desegregation is no magic formula and black-power people who say this are quite correct. They have no difficulty in finding these living hells to point to the failures of desegregation. I try to use the two words quite carefully. "Desegregation" is the mere mix. "Integration" is the goal, and it requires the prerequisite to mix, the desegregation. But, it obviously refers to something more than just having black and white bodies in the same institution.

It obviously refers to the quality of the association between Negro and white children. The quality is, to put it in simplest terms, cross-racial acceptance. We measured this in the Coleman Report data by simply asking the children the race of their close friends. When you have a school where the Negro children are telling me that some of their close friends are white and the white children are saying some of their close friends are Negro, this is what I mean by an integrated rather than merely a desegregated school. It is the integrated schools with cross-racial acceptance where you get the improved performance of Negro American children and where you get the rather drastically altered racial attitudes of both the Negro and white children toward each other. You will not get this achievement benefit for Negro children, nor the attitude benefits for Negro and white children, in merely desegregated schools where you do not have cross-racial acceptance. In fact, it takes very little imagination to conjure up some desegregated schools that are worse than segregated schools for generating racial hate and distrust.

We do have integrated schools in America. I was surprised in the Coleman data to find we have as many integrated schools as we do. We even have some in the South. It does happen and happens when the school does not reflect the community. These homilies that the school has to reflect the community is the problem. A school has to be something we would like to see the community become. As long as the school reflects the community, I think we are lost.

Many of the other findings you will find in the Commission of Civil Rights report follow logically. Integration has its biggest effect for both white and Negro children in both achievement and attitudes when it starts early, the earlier, the better. You can still get some minimal benefits with high school integration, not desegregation, when children, white and Negro, have not had previous experience together, but they are minimal. It is hard to achieve integration. They are used to segregation. They are not accustomed to each other. It is very difficult to get cross-racial acceptance after you have segregated them for eight or nine years.

At the elementary level where it is easiest, it is also where it is most effective. Even the white citizens' council agrees in the South. They have objected viciously to the stair-step plan starting at the kindergarten because they said the kids at that level are too young to know any better. They are absolutely right! That is why that level is the most critical.

This is why I am not too excited about the great high school plan of Pittsburgh. It is high school and it is anti-metropolitan.

Cumulative effects, then, are what we find. Those who have known segregation all their lives prefer segregation. If you want to understand separateness in the black power movement, you need only ask what has been their experience in American life. They have known separatism. They are saying, "If we have got to have it then let us have it a little better than we have got it." They prefer it. So do whites who have only known segregation. In similar studies that we did especially for the commission report, we found both white and Negro adults are more likely to live now in an inter-racial neighborhood, to work in a job with equal status to members of the other race and to send their children to integrated schools if they had integrated experience as children. Just the opposite is true for those who had known only segregation as children, white and Negro. They were overwhelmingly likely to send their children to segregated schools and not to make any sacrifice. It takes a personal sacrifice now to get integration for your child, if possible at all.

Actually, these data are the strongest endorsement of integration, not just desegregation, that I have ever seen from any data. The products of it believe in it. White and Negro work very hard to provide it for their kids. Other people, white and Negro, do not. But remember the statistics. We are becoming more segregated in our schools, not less. By producing more people, Negro and white, who will not prefer integration for their children, the tide is against us.

If we could turn the corner, we could begin to produce a very different type of American. People ask me how do you change the anti-Negro attitudes of white people. I think that is a wrong question. The right question is, "How do we change societal structure which produces these attitudes?" We have been having brotherhood dinners for generations without any noticeable effect, except maybe negative. You do not talk people out of prejudice. They live it out, and the best way is the earliest years of life. The only important social intervention that society makes in the early years is the school.

Where does this leave us as to remedy? We are getting more sick, again. It has harmful effects. So what? What can you do about it? We are told by such eminent educational experts as Joseph Alsop that we ought to have compensatory education. It can be done, he says. It is being done in New York, he says, with the More Effective Schools Program. This is a perfectly decent try by some hard working people, but it is not having the effects Mr. Alsop claims for it. The people in the effort, by the way, do not make these claims and try to beg Mr. Alsop not to make them for them. If you remember his early piece in the New Republic, he even claimed two More Effective Schools that proved beyond a shadow of doubt that a Harlem ghetto school could be great, that these two schools were well above grade average and so forth. They turned out, on investigation, to be 70 percent Jewish schools in the Bronx.

The commission report reviewed what was at that time, two years ago, the compensatory programs throughout the nation which had had the longest time to succeed. It is unfair to evaluate a program after a year or two in education. What you find is what has been well known to social scientists for a long time and what you should guard against in evaluating your own programs in your own states. It is the "Hawthorne Effect" named for a plan at Western Electric that was worked on in the 1930's.

There, some sociologists and psychologists were wedded to the theory that the way to produce higher production on an assembly line and make workers happy was to have better lighting and better air conditioning. They set up a special lab. They varied the lighting and the air conditioning and whatever. It did not matter what they did. It could be practically dark, freezing cold and no rest periods, but production kept right on going up. Why? Because the women they had picked randomly off the production line -- and no one ever thinks he is picked randomly -- believed "I am a little more special than that girl next to me." They thought they were elite. They were treated as elite. Up goes the production for awhile. Then withdraw attention, and of course the production comes down. It was not the light. It was the special treatment.

This is what typically happens in a school program. Almost any intelligent intervention, short of hitting the kid over the head, will increase his achievement -- any kid, any school. If it provides him more attention, more love, he says, "This is what I have been expecting all along, and now you finally get around to it." It does not matter what the theory is behind it that makes you give him more attention for awhile. And then, of course, the tension slackens, the creative people start new programs and go on to the next system. The people who follow them do not believe in it as much, etc. and down comes enthusiasm; down come the scores. You can follow this in every one of these compensatory programs. At first the kids are doing better, which proves they can do better under the right conditions. Then after a couple of years, if you come in and say you would like to see the data, you are told, "Sorry but those data are not available for the public anymore." Then they become impounded. In a year or so more the program quietly drops out. It is not carried in the newspapers, unless on the back page where it says the program director has now been shifted to the junior high schools or that he is starting another program.

It is not the fact that these programs did not have a point or that the people who started them were not dedicated. My point is they did not change the structure enough so that all you got was the "Hawthorne." This is what the commission found over and over again.

It has been interpreted that the commission came out with the conclusion that compensatory education was a failure. It is not a correct interpretation of what the commission found. The commission found that compensatory educational programs as they have been tried in ghetto schools have not been effective substitutes for racial integration. Where racial integration has given increases in achievement and improvement in attitudes for both white and Negro children, it has been over time, sustained improvement. The commission called for the obvious then. Why not have compensatory education and integration together? It was not an attack on compensatory or newer methods of running schools.

There are two kinds of ghetto situations, to oversimplify it, and I want to make it clear because of two different kinds of conclusions that lead from them. A small ghetto situation is where the percentage of the Negro American student population is roughly 10 percent or less. There, the remedies are straight-forward, which means courage and good faith. You can desegregate within the district at all levels, including the all-important elementary level. You can do it with district-wide redrawing, positive gerrymandering instead of our centuries of negative gerrymandering, new school construction, feeder arrangements and so forth.

When you are talking about the big ghetto situation, you are talking about a Detroit. The big problem is obviously how would you desegregate? Clearly, the demography is such that you cannot do it within the central city. The fact is you would need to go into metropolitan cooperative plans. This does not mean you would have to have metropolitan consolidation. In fact, I would suspect it would be preferable not to have. At any rate, it is not necessary. But cooperative plans, yes. You would also need cooperation between the public and private school systems. The remedies obviously must go across the district lines we now have, must involve cooperation between public and private schools which would meet constitutional tests, and must draw from relatively large areas.

I am obviously speaking of the future, not tomorrow. But, we cannot divide these two. We cannot do things now which will be counter-productive in the future.

Let me describe to you what would be my own personal solution. I do not think it would fit all areas and it would obviously have to be tailored to fit the specifications of particular areas. I would like to see post-Vietnam days come to America when money is again available, and we could get a federal construction bill of major dimensions. I do not know how much, but two billion dollars a year is not out of the range of strong possibility. This would give us a great opportunity to either go over the hill and to form segregated schools for the next two generations or to begin to really turn the corner. If the federal government sets up its school construction bill after Vietnam in the way it is set up for 1965 under ESEA, I believe it would be ruinous for American education. We have to have some controls on that federal money. Where will Mrs. Hicks build a new school in Boston? She would build it smack in the ghetto. In other words, there is the danger of the exploitation of separatism and the black power idealogy. I do not think you can build it in the ghetto, but neither can you build it in the most plush part of Evanston for south-side Chicago either. I think one important criteria for the site of a metropolitan park must be that it is non-racial, that it be on neutral terms. The school cannot be a middle-class white school in identity to be an effective integrated school. The kinds of educational parks I am talking about are not white schools or Negro schools, on not clearly white or Negro ground. They have to be obviously on the spokes of mass transit systems. Bring the suburban kids in; bring the city kids out. They can be in the inner-city. They can be on the border of the suburbs and the inner city.

I believe the money will become available at the close of Vietnam. It is the form of it I worry about, not its availability. Let me point out the important ingredient in all this, which has generally been missing. Although there is obviously something in it for white kids as well as Negro kids by integration, I believe the issue has been focused on too narrowly in America on education. We have to broaden the issue. The fact of the matter is, American public schools are not what they should be in many ways, not just racially. We need to take the metropolitan educational park and other similar schemes as an invitation to improve on all these problems, not just on race problems. When the racial issue then becomes a component rather than the only focus, it becomes a very different political package.

The advantages are clear. There would be considerable capital and operating savings, even when you count the cost of busing. Second, when you start a new institution, you have a marvelous new opportunity for innovation, not just physical innovation, newly designed schools, electronic gadgetry, etc., but also social structure innovation. A more differentiated teacher role, for instance. We need to have wider course offerings. Frankly, we need to have some status courses. Why do people send their children to private school, often at some great expense? Not because the private school typically offers such great education. If you really look into it, it often does not. Often the rival public school is doing as well or better. They send them for status reasons, because it has a swimming pool or an ice rink. I want some ice rinks, some Olympic pools, some status symbols in the educational park. Middle-class children, white and Negro, are a resource. We need to keep them as a resource for disadvantaged children and the way to keep them is with status. I am half serious in what I call my "lute principle." I want a course that teaches playing the lute. In an educational park of 12,000 kids, if 20 kids want to play the lute to make it economical, all right.

In my mind's eye, what I see is a card party of white mothers, and the woman dealing the cards has a little girl who goes to the educational park and is in a lute course. There is a bigoted mother, and the point of integration that frightens whites is the status threat. So, she is dealing the cards, and the bigoted mother says, "Is your little girl going to that school where you know colored kids are bused in as well as the white kids?" I want the mother of the girl attending the park, without missing a card in the deal to say, "Does your child know how to play the lute?" I want a status answer to a status threat. Frankly, I do not think we are going to get integration until we package it in a very different way. Incidentally, Negro Americans have nothing against status either. The main problem it seems to me with Negro Americans is that they are also Americans, and they do not mind status aspects. They will be in the lute course, too.

I also want to point out that the park is ideal for more coordination than we presently have with higher education. It is ideal for more constitutionally permissible cooperation with many private or parochial systems. The parochial system can buy a plot of land next to the park. It builds its own school, but it does not put into it all the expensive things which, more and more, Roman Catholic education is finding impossible to afford, expensive things like the gymnasium, the stadium, the physics and chemistry labs. For these, the parochial children use these facilities in the park. They do not come over as a parochial group and go back to school as many of our shared systems do now. That is the best way to increase religious prejudice and hate that was ever devised. They come over as individuals, and they take physics in the 6th period when it suits their schedule.

There are disadvantages. It is very expensive. We will need federal aid. We will also need state aid. In addition to being expensive, it has the disadvantage that if you make a mistake, you make a hell of a mistake. You put 15 million dollars in a park in a wrong place, and you will not be able to forget it as some of the mistakes we have already made in placing some individual school units. You have the problem of phasing out existing schools. This is no problem in a system that desperately needs new space and has old schools. Finally you have the problem of the impersonalization of a large complex. Yet the newest elementary schools, junior highs and high schools built in your state you will find, particularly in urban areas, are built for a larger capacity than any school of that level before. For hard economic reasons we are building larger and larger schools throughout America. But actually, the park enables you through capital savings to reverse that tide and go back to smaller units than we have been able to afford recently. The park might have 2 or 3 high schools, 6 or 8 middle schools, 10, 12, 15 elementary schools. I am thinking of course in campus terms.

I do not believe that the metropolitan educational parks are the only way to do it. Nor do I believe that it will be easy to bring them about. Nor do I believe it will come about tomorrow. But I do think that we have to think in the long term as well as the short term, that we have to judge short-term solutions which we need in terms of their counter-productive or their productive aspects for the future. In the long term, we can only listen to the Kerner Commission. Do we want one nation divisible or indivisible?

SEGREGATION AND EDUCATION

Robert L. Green
Professor of Educational Psychology
Michigan State University

The recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concluded that the root cause of the American black's unequal treatment and resulting unrest is a function of white American racism--namely, white refusal to accept blacks as human beings and social and economic equals. The significance of this conclusion lies in the fact that it was unanimously agreed to by a representative group of 11 moderate, middle-class Americans, nine of whom are white. An imprudent aspect of white racism is rooted in education. This is exemplified by the fact that America has ignored the 1954 mandate which abolished legal segregation in the field of education with the directive that we move towards creating a multi-racial educational system, and has allowed the educational system to become more racist and segregated.

It is well known that the vast majority of inner-city and suburban schools are rigidly segregated. Almost 90 percent of all American black students attended schools two and one-half years ago which had a majority of black students. This has been intensified since 1965. In the 75 major central cities surveyed by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights 83 percent of all white students attended schools at the elementary school level with 90 to 100 percent white enrollment. School board members and school teachers have remained essentially passive or either silent on this major aspect of American racism.

American blacks have long known that facilities and curricula in black schools were inadequate and did not come close to approximating the facilities and curricula in white schools -- North, South, East and West. Black parents have known that black schools are not only overcrowded, but are also the oldest and most poorly equipped.

The report of the Commission on Civil Disorders was not needed to inform black parents that in the city of Detroit 30 schools with 98 to 100 percent black enrollment were dedicated during the administration of President Grant; or that in Cincinnati, Ohio, from 1950 to 1955, although the black student population expanded at a faster pace than white most additional schools planned and constructed were in predominately or nearly all white areas, while black students were in the process of being sandwiched in predominately black schools. This black parents have known.

Black parents have also known that white teachers of the poor black rarely live in the community where they work and have little sympathy or understanding for the lives that black people and their black children are forced to live. Black parents, teachers and students have known that in black schools you will find in leadership roles white principals, white assistant principals and even white secretaries in the office to make decisions about black children. This we have known and we have known for years. Black parents have also known that these conditions are unique and related primarily to black communities.

What then must be done to cope with the present situation that we are confronted with in America -- namely, that of two separate educational systems, one for black students and one for white students? This is a very sensitive topic and one that many school board members and teachers like to avoid. It is difficult to acknowledge the existence of two separate and unequal educational systems in America, but the data is clear in that they exist.

In terms of an immediate thrust, I must assert that I, like most blacks, am yet committed to the establishment of a multi-racial democratic society, a society that most white Americans historically have refused to accept and support. However, I recognize that the recalcitrant racism in the white community will continue to maintain and support segregated schools for a number of years to come. This is a fact. This is a reality that black people throughout America must face in 1968.

If white education experts perceive that school integration is functional and will facilitate the academic achievement of both black and white students, then their task is to convince the white community. The major concern is to convince white school board members that school integration is functional, to convince white, strongly structured unions that school integration is functional. Black parents have felt this for years and we have supported this in principle.

Black Americans long ago demonstrated by supporting moderation, gradualism and immobility on the part of the white community that they were committed to the notion of a multi-racial society. However, black people have not been able to desegregate public schools in America, but are in the process of developing the power to grasp and to control the schools that are predominately black and to hold schools accountable for the non-academic achievement of black students. This is the major distinction between the white community and the black community. White middle-class parents have been able to do a fantastic job of holding schools accountable when their children fail to achieve academically. They place the onus not on the individual child, not on the white community but on the school system itself. Yet, when black youngsters fail to achieve academically and we find them performing two and one-half to three years below grade level in reading and social studies skills, the blame is placed on the black "family."

If there is any meaningful thrust within the black power movement, it is related to the notion and the concept that many black parents are now beginning to say: "If our children do not perform well academically, then the responsibility and the onus must rest with the white establishment, because the white establishment is responsible for school programs that are now structured in the black community."

The responsibility of school desgregation at this point in time must rest with white administrators, white school board members and the white community. Racism among school teachers, teachers' unions and school boards is responsible for the segregated order of American education. We cannot place the blame on the "vague white community." Are not the powerful teacher organizations and teachers themselves members of that community? Are not white school board members elected by the community because community members foresee that they represent their interests?

We cannot pass the buck in 1968. We must be honest. Change must come from those who control the public school system.

In black schools we must have black administrators, black principals, vice principals and secretaries. It is important because in 1968, as in the past, it is important and necessary for black youngsters to have responsible and important and significant models. Where in America, do we find black school administrators in essentially all white schools? As a matter of fact, this is what we should have. We should have black school administrators in all white schools and black school administrators in all black schools. The reason for this is related to the point of view that white youngsters have always had strong models. Educators in the past developed programs that provided superordinate models for white youngsters and subordinate models for black youngsters. We can modify unfortunate practice, placing strong black leaders in black schools.

In 1968 I'm a realist. We have segregation. And we can no longer wait for the token bone of integration. If whites want to desegregate the schools, fine. Let them go ahead and do it. They have the power to do it. The black community does not have the power to desegregate the schools in Detroit, or Flint, Michigan, or even Hartford, Connecticut. Yet the burden of integration is placed on the black community. In Hartford they are busing black kids 25 to 30 miles out to suburban white communities.

Busing by the way, is a very unique concept and one that has always fascinated me. What does busing mean? It is interesting to note that busing in the South is a way of life. You will find that black children in the South today are bused 25, 30 and in some cases 40 miles per day, and this has been going on for the last 118 years; since the beginning of public education in the South. In the state of Alabama as a matter of fact, a major appropriation that is made each year by the state legislature is to be made available for busing white children to white schools and black children to black schools. The reason that this is necessary is related to the fact that in many communities in the South, blacks and whites live side by side. I worked in Selma, Alabama, for a brief period of time, and it is very interesting to note that in Selma, you will find blacks and whites living side by side on some streets. You will find blacks and whites sharing the same garden in Selma, Alabama. If you drive through Mississippi, you will find blacks and whites living across the highway from each other. You will find blacks and whites sharing the same water well. On the Mississippi march, we could not get water from blacks, because blacks would say, "Half of the well belongs to the white man, my white neighbor." This has been going on for years. So, therefore, in the South in order to maintain segregation, they have had to bus whites away from their integrated living communities to all-white segregated schools. Then we come to a northern urban community and we find that everyone favors the neighborhood school concept. We say that busing is bad. Busing is bad because neighborhoods are segregated, and it is very convenient to hold youngsters together in their segregated school.

One other point about power. There has been a lot of discussion about black power. In this regard, I would like to talk about teacher power, school board power and perhaps administrative power. The January 20th (1968) issue of Saturday Review focuses on the growing militancy among teachers. It cites the activities of teachers in Florida, Michigan, Illinois, Maryland and Kentucky as they endeavor to wield power in determining their own professional fate. Let me say that this is one ingredient, one component, of black power that whites often see as threatening. Teachers have discarded the image of the meek, humble, acquiescent public servant and have assumed a new stance. This striving for an acceptance of a new identity is analogous to the process that blacks are currently undergoing in their search for meaning and identity in a society that has expected them to be meek, humble and acquiescent. Teachers, because they have so long been in the position where they have had little voice over their personal and professional behavior, should have great empathy for this kindred struggle of black Americans; therefore, teachers, as they gain power, and administrators should be willing to use their power as an instrument for social change.

Teacher, administrative and school board power should focus in two directions. Teachers and administrators should first focus their power introspectively and get their own house in order. Teachers, administrators and school board members should direct their power at teachers who are content to draw their salary and provide the very minimum of educational experiences for their students. They should direct their power at school boards which permit inequity of instructional materials, special services and pupil-teacher ratios within the black community. They should direct their power at administrators who have higher regard for waxed floors and quiet classrooms than the intellectual development of their students; at supervisory personnel who have been promoted not for expertise in subject matter and skill in human relations, but simply for years of service. They should direct their power at teachers who, serving on curricula committees, are given relief time and regard this as a holiday. They should direct their power at teachers who gather in the lounge or lunch room and castigate their students; at teachers who direct their attention to the "teachables" and let the difficult one or handicapped child increase his educational deficits.

Secondly, teachers should direct their energies towards making their community a better place to live. How can educators encourage students to respect the Constitution and then disregard the Bill of Rights outside the confines of the classroom? How can educators speak of the checks and balance system under which our federal government operates and then condone open defiance of the Supreme Court decision? How can educators develop in their students a love for foreign languages and not a concern for the destruction of foreign countries. How can teachers encourage cooperativeness and group concern and then display hatred toward another community? How often have you heard the admonition, "What you do speaks so loudly, I cannot hear what you are saying"?

Children can easily perceive the discrepancy between values extolled in school and the behavior of advocates within the community. The search for meaning that permeates our middle-class youth and results in many of them becoming cynical and not trusting anyone over 30, especially black youths, has developed out of the polarity between white middle-class values and white middle-class behavior. Teachers, administrators and school board members must become a powerful force in closing the gap between what is and what ought to be.

Administrators, school board members and teachers should encourage curricular changes. I often think of history. black history, being in the curriculum. I think of black history due to the fact that I served on a committee here in Michigan set up by the State Department of Education to evaluate textbooks that are currently being used in the public school system here in Michigan. It is unfortunate that even today, textbooks have not been honest and have not been fair. To a great extent, educators have tolerated the writings of historians, the writings of social studies experts regarding the contributions of black people to the development of America. We are often told such stories about George Washington and his efforts with the cherry tree. We never tell youngsters about the accomplishments of black students, black individuals in American life. I hold school board members administrators responsible for this. When you purchase textbooks that are not honest and fair, then we perpetuate this kind of writing. We never tell youngsters about Dr. Daniel Hale Williams who performed the first successful heart operation in America or the other accomplishments of black Americans. We do tell them about George Washington and the fact that he was a good guy because he ate cherry pie and never told a lie. We tell them about Thomas Jefferson, and the wonderful things he did in developing the great United States of America, yet educators fail to talk about W. E. B. DuBois who worked a lifetime to make democracy work in America, but died in Ghana after giving up on a system that talked about democracy but practiced racism.

In summary, we perhaps can look on school desegregation as being some ideal, but on the other hand, black Americans cannot wait until white America is willing to desegregate schools. We must seek a meaningful, functional strategy now. And one functional strategy is black control of schools that are essentially black. The plantation notion of having whites control black schools has ended.

I would readily say that a multi-racial school system is a worthy ideal, but your task and the task of white experts is to convince white America that this is so. The real concern and the real thrust here is (1) black control of black schools and (2) accountability. This is not to say that black administrators always have the best interests of black youngsters at heart. Here we need a system of accountability within the black community so that we can hold black school principals and administrators accountable for the achievement of black children. This is the concern in 1968. However, when white America is ready to beging building a multi-racial school community, blacks will probably be willing to listen.

THE PROGRAM FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dr. Gregory Anrig
Director, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities
U.S. Office of Education

There are very many federal programs, and you are familiar with the resources they provide to you. However, I point out that most of these programs are really legislation and funds which are given to the Office of Education and, in turn, given to the states to administer. These programs that can be used for equal educational opportunities are largely state administered or will be state-administered programs.

There is one program, however, which is uniquely that of the federal government. I would like to refer to that one in particular. As we look over the current need for desegregation, we find that eighty-seven percent of the Negro children in the North who are entering and beginning school will begin school and stay in schools that are at least 50 percent or more minority group enrollment. In the South, where we have allegedly have had a great deal of progress, and indeed we have had progress, only 18 percent of the Negro children are attending desegregated schools, and sometimes doing so only in a very, very small group. We have a long, long ways to go, and some of us who get impatient with this feel that we must go much faster and much more effectively.

One of the bills which has been most helpful in this has been the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It had two parts that affected schools. The first Title VI, which in effect was the stick of the law, said that federal funds could not be used in a discriminatory manner. The compliance part of that law and the assistance part, Title IV, had previously been administered by the U.S. Office of Education. The decision this past year was to reorganize civil rights efforts and to concentrate or centralize all compliance activities in a new Office for Civil Rights, directly under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. There were some, I am sure, who thought that that would weaken the compliance effort. In effect, what it has done is simply transfer the compliance enforcement from one very vigorous leader to another very vigorous leader.

There has been a side benefit to this reorganization, however. For the first time, the assistance part of the Civil Rights Act, the part that really for very understandable reasons had been overshadowed by the compliance part for political and other reasons, at last has identity of its own.

Commissioner Howe announced on November 17 (1967) at the civil rights conference in Washington that there would be created a new organization in the Office of Education designed to give assistance of varying kinds directly to local school districts and to states to help them face the problem and the challenge of school desegregation. This new division, called the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, had two missions: first, it was to administer Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, the assistance part, and secondly, within the Office of Education, it had a responsibility to the Office of Education's own conscience when it comes to equal educational opportunities. It was our job to see that all federal programs in the Office of Education were administered consciously to bring about equal educational opportunities. I can assure you we have been doing this with Commissioner Howe's full backing, not only publicly but in the inner-circles of the office.

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act provides for three general categories of assistance, and this new unit was designed to provide that assistance. First, the commissioner is authorized to provide to school districts and to states people competent to advise them on how to go about desegregating school districts, the so-called technical assistance role. We are there to help school districts plan, develop and implement desegregation plans. Secondly, the division is authorized to give grants of money to universities to conduct training institutes for school personnel. Third, the division is authorized to give grants directly to local school boards which are planning or undergoing desegregation to help with the training of their teachers and also to obtain consultant help either part-time or on their staff.

There was one catch to this. When the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964, there was one amendment. When they defined the term "desegregation," they defined it as you and I would, meaning not to assign youngsters without regard to race, color or creed. But there was an amendment added which said directly "desegregation" shall not be defined to include the assignment of students to overcome racial imbalance. It has been that amendment which has been somewhat hampering to both assistance and enforcement activities north of the Mason-Dixon line. The effect of this has been that most of the attention, most of the effort has gone toward the de jure school systems, those in the 17 southern and border states. The situation is changing somewhat and we are attempting now to anticipate that change.

One of the major objectives of our new division is to support state education departments, North and South, in their efforts to carry out the leadership responsibilities which are theirs in desegregation and in assuring equal educational opportunities. We feel that desegregation cannot take place and if it does take place, cannot succeed without the strongest possible leadership at the state level. Some states, including Michigan, are already exerting this leadership.

In the past two years, our particular program has been funding two units in the state education departments of New York and California. These units, designed to provide the same kind of assistance that the federal government is authorized to provide under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, have been very successful. Their design is to provide assistance from the state level to school districts which are attempting to face the problems of ending racial isolation in their schools. A sign of their success is that these units, in both states, have now been expanded with state funds voted by the legislatures and that this year, the legislature in New York also voted a grant fund of $3 million to be administered by the unit to help local school districts face the challenge of desegregation.

Our commitment to the importance of state leadership in desegregation and our experience in New York and California have made us decide to make state grants a major priority of our new division with the very limited funds we have available to us. We anticipate this year about 12 state education department grants outside of the South. Under Michigan Superintendent Ira Polley's leadership, Michigan has been one of the first to receive a grant. It is designed to expand the equal educational opportunities program which had already begun in this state and I think it has made a great mark for itself.

You might be interested in the objectives of the Michigan project, which was approved: to assist local school authorities in the solution of problems incident to segregation; to increase the effectiveness of inter-agency relationships, federal and state, designed to support equal educational opportunity efforts; to assure that State Department of Education policies, programs and activities are supportive of federal and state equal educational opportunity policies and to increase the skill of its personnel in affirmatively applying these policies; to enhance the ability of the state education department to advise state and local authorities on all matters dealing with school desegregation and equality of educational opportunity; and to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of experience and information that will contribute to effective implementation of the state's equal educational opportunity guarantee. These units, therefore, are useful not only to local school districts, but useful also to the state education department itself.

These new units that are coming up in states are especially important in this particular year. I say especially important because of one major development you may have read about in the newspapers recently. You have heard for many years the discussion going on south of the Mason-Dixon line about the dreaded school desegregation guidelines. For the first time, Congress has directed that school desegregation policies be applied nationally to the extent that the law makes this possible and that the guidelines be for both North and South. Last week the new national school policies of the Office for Civil Rights were announced and are being distributed to state education departments. I would like to read just two parts that apply to northern school districts.

The general section of the general compliance section, which applies to both North and South, reads as follows: "Schools and school systems are responsible for assuring that the services, facilities, activities, and programs which they conduct or sponsor or with which they are affiliated are free of discrimination on the ground of race, color or national origin. This responsibility precludes the system from segregating students or from denying equal educational opportunities to students on the ground of race, color or national origin. Each school system has the affirmative duty under law to take prompt and effective action to eliminate segregation and other discrimination based on race, color or national origin and to correct the effects of past discrimination." That paragraph, I can assure you is written with great care and great scrutiny. I think as you read that, you see an opportunity to do something in the North that we have been hoping for many years.

The second section deals with equal educational opportunities: "When there are students of a particular race, color or national origin concentrated in certain schools or classes, school systems are responsible for assuring that these students are not denied equal educational opportunities by practices which are less favorable for educational advancement than the practices that schools or classes attended primarily by students of any other race, color or national origin." Those two sections are the most significant for northern school districts.

There certainly are other federal programs that have been of assistance to school districts undergoing desegregation. I would certainly point out that, of course Title I, ESEA, has made available to the disadvantaged child those things which for many years have been available to the child in the affluent school district. Title III, ESEA, has provided money for imaginative and new ideas and has led to the development of such things as magnet schools, educational parks, urban-suburban cooperatives and projects of this caliber. I would point out that because of an amendment, Title III will now be administered by state education departments rather than by the Office of Education. So, here again is another resource for states to use in advancing equal educational opportunities. Congress, in giving to the states Title I and Title III has obviously placed its confidence in them, a confidence which affords the money and the opportunity to have a real impact on correcting inequities of the past.

It is for that reason that the assistance services I first described under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act are so heavily focused on state education departments. Never before in our history have conditions been so much in favor of achieving equal educational opportunities for children. We have more funds than ever before, the state of the law is increasingly in our favor, and the need as was shown in the riot commission report and in the riots themselves grows more evident by the day. The individual examples of courage and leadership which we see are more evident every day. It is no longer going to be the exception for somebody to take a strong stand and move ahead with his school district.

I think the overall topic of NASBE this year is a very critical one: "School Boards as Agents of Change." If you are to gain anything from this conference, and I am sure you will, it should be I would hope a desire to go back and look and say, "What am I doing--what are we doing in my particular state to advance this very important need?" I think it is also critical that you say to yourself, "Do people know where we stand?" I point out the statement done by the Michigan State Board of Education and the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. I think their work together and their statement is a positive and helpful direction for states to go in. They have laid it on the line. They say, this we believe, and this we are going to act in. My last words to you are: Where do you stand? I hope you will take a forceful stand with these opportunities.

INTEGRATION IN THE EVANSTON SCHOOLS

Dr. Gregory Coffin
Superintendent, Evanston, Illinois Schools

The point of my coming here is simply to indicate to you and attempt to describe an ongoing program. We do not think it is perfect. I was not the originator or author of it. I am merely the implementer. I am not a naive kid who has never been exposed to a black power point of view before. We think it is extremely important that our teachers and our citizens have an opportunity to hear all points of view, regardless of what they are. We subscribe to much of the black power point of view. As a matter of fact, had it not been for carefully directed black power, we would not have the program in effect in Evanston which we have at the present time -- that is black power exerted at the right time in the right place in order to make people move.

The program in Evanston, which is essentially a program which has fully integrated all of the schools, did not grow out of the great altruism of a collection of liberal-minded school board members or liberal-minded people generally. Evanston is not essentially a liberal community. The registration is four-to-one Republican against Democrats, and this is part of the nature of the community. I am very proud of the community, not just for what it has done without any help from me in its schools, but what it has done in many other areas and is continuing to do.

First of all, we believe in Evanston that the cycle of education, employment and housing is in this pattern. Quality integrated education comes first. When kids have that, they can get decent jobs and when people have decent jobs, they can get decent housing. We do not believe that you wait for housing to integrate the schools. If you do, you will wait at least another 100 years. You start where you are. You start now. You do what can be done, whatever the community is, to promote quality integrated education. As a matter of fact, where it is possible, we feel that you cannot have really optimum quality education unless you do have integration.

To give you some idea of the community, it is relatively small -- nine and one-half square miles with a population of the school district in the 1960 census of 88,000. It is closer to 100,000 today. It is a compact type community. It is not a bedroom suburb nor an industrial community. It is a somewhat heterogeneous community. We have in the community at the present time approximately 12 percent Negro. We had 10 percent in 1960. We had at that time 2,500 and some representatives of other minority groups. We are not like a Winnetka or a Glencoe or a bedroom suburb. Most of the people who live there commute to Chicago and most of the people are in a professional class. In terms of income level, in the 1960 census the median was $9,193. Again, I would contrast this with a Winnetka where the median income was about $18 000. We are not a totally atypical community, that is not totally different from many of the communities represented here and in other places.

Now getting to the issue, we are one of the small cities that has its ghetto. I think the ghetto is very obvious. We have the Chicago sanitary district canal cutting the town roughly in half. The school that served the black community up until this year--and the community has believed for a long time in the neighborhood school concept--has been all black for as long as it has been there. The first Negroes came to Evanston in 1840. Evanston was a stopping point in the underground railroad, and the people have been there ever since. So for many generations the Foster school was all black. The school next to it was 65 percent Negro. There were three other integrated schools in the city and there were about 10 all-white segregated schools.

In 1964 the first real recognition of the problem that existed was expressed in a resolution passed by our board of education which said, "We deplore de facto segregation in any form white or black." It said further, "We resolve to eliminate de facto segregation in our school system. We resolve to eliminate de facto segregation, white or black." They did not say, "We are going to desegregate the Foster school, which was all black." They said, "We are going to integrate all of the schools."

As I travel around to different parts of the country and to different cities here in the Midwest I do not see some of the efforts which could be going on to eliminate the white segregated schools. I was in Gary recently, where 70 percent of the school population is non-white, 60 percent Negro and 10 percent other minority groups. I am not sure that Gary can integrate all of its schools or eliminate all of its black segregation. But I am sure if Gary wants to, Gary can eliminate all of its white segregation, and this is an important step also.

A white segregated school today in 1968 is a culturally deprived environment for boys and girls to grow up in. The cultural deprivation of a white segregated school is different from the cultural deprivation of a black segregated school, but they are both culturally deprived. The youngsters growing up today are growing up to live in a multi-racial society. They are living in isolation from that society in their white suburbs and in other places in the country all too often today. If we allow this pattern to be perpetuated, we are going to educate another generation of bigots. We are reaping a harvest of several generations of bigots at the present time. So our board's action then in making this resolution to eliminate white segregation as well as black was a very important step.

The next important step taken by the board was in 1965 when they appointed a citizens' advisory commission made up of 18 citizens from all walks of life in the community to come up with a plan to implement their resolution. This was not a study committee. They had already had two study committees, and they had two file cabinets full of reports of study committees collecting dust. This was an activist commission that was directed to come up with a specific plan for implementing the resolution and eliminating both white and black segregation. The commission worked throughout 1965 and into 1966.

We had some very smart people on this commission, and one of the people came up with the bright idea of contracting the Illinois Institute of Technology to see if a computer might be helpful in resolving the problem and drawing a plan. The computer was programmed for a relatively simple technique of redistributing the youngsters so that no school would be populated beyond its capacity, no school would have more than 25 percent Negro (the Negro enrollment in the school district is 22 percent), and so that a maximum number of children would be assigned to schools within one mile of their homes, sticking with the neighborhood school policies. This was not a difficult computer program to construct and this computer program is still available and is free to the public at the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute.

A lot of communities have fooled around with paper and pencil with the figures trying to find out new ways and so on. In effect, all they have to do is punch up some basic data on every kid on a card, and the computer will draw the map, project the map on a cathode ray tube. From that point, boards of education can work in tailoring those maps any way they would like to tailor them. What the computer did was to redraw the district boundary lines, the school attendance area boundary lines, cutting into the ghetto. The computer redrew the maps in such a way that all the contiguous schools to the ghetto had pieces cutting into the ghetto so that these youngsters who lived on the other side of the canal are attending that school instead of the old, all-black Foster school. Actually this school is as close to their homes as was the other school. The canal has many bridges across it, and there is no reason why it should be a physical barrier. These youngsters are still attending a neighborhood school, but the neighborhood school happens to be on the other side of the canal. In many instances the computer came up with some far better patterns than those that had existed previously on the other side of the canal.

It was not possible to reassign all the kids to a school within one mile of their homes. Actually, 450 kids out of the 11,000 in the district could not be assigned on this basis. So the commission assigned these youngsters by hand, to five schools on the periphery. They are bused to those schools by neighborhood patterns, quite different from the Princeton plan. These youngsters do not have a neighborhood school in the traditional sense, but they do have a neighborhood school in terms of their being bused by neighborhood groups. This was not an easy thing to sell. The rumors were rampant in the community that most of the youngsters in town under the redistricting plan were going to have to be moved. We developed what we call our stability chart, showing the number of youngsters who would be staying and the percent moving. We demonstrated that the rumor that was prevailing was just not the case.

We had hundreds of other rumors. We put out fact sheets and ran a really hard PR campaign in order to get fact into the vacuum of false information which persisted. On another chart, the one we called the efficiency chart to appeal to the businessman, we demonstrated that under the new plan, the total plan, all the schools in the district were being more efficiently utilized with relation to their capacity than they were under the old plan. Actually, under the old plan, we had many under-used schools and we had some over-used schools. The Foster school was greatly under-used, deliberately so, because three years before we had a voluntary busing program. This had been going for three years and we did not feel that it was doing enough. We also had compensatory education for three years and we did not feel that that was doing enough.

This was the plan. It was essential that we put on a very vigorous campaign. We did. Demonstrations were a part of it. The demonstrations obviously were not organized by the school department. They were organized by other groups. They were essentially peaceful demonstrations. They were very effective. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that the plan would have been voted had it not been for some threats of boycotts, some very vigorous speeches and pressure from various parts of the community. We still have pressures; however, the program is working well. We recognize the fact that to date we have just physically integrated the schools. We are working on many fronts to psychologically integrate the schools. We are working with the Boy Scouts, the YMCA, with the churches, with the recreation department, with all kinds of social agencies to see that these youngsters become a part of that school and identified with that school as their school so that they are not disadvantaged black youngsters being bused to a white populated, advantaged school. We are meeting considerable success with this. We still have a long way to go, but I think that in many of the schools there is now this feeling.

We have been aided tremendously by help from the Civil Rights Commission and by other governmental agencies. We have had grants for the past two years for summer institutes in which we have involved hundreds of teachers. We have a continuing in-service program for this. We had a Title III grant to set up in the old Foster school a laboratory school in conjunction with Northwestern University. We had to utilize it as a school. We put some status symbols in it. We had over 900 applications for 600 places. This school was located in the heart of the ghetto, but white youngsters are bused in to that school because their parents want them to go to that school. It has thus far been very successful.

We do not claim to be perfect. We do claim to have a working program of integration in all of our schools, and we do not like to be condemned by those who would suggest that there are no working programs in existence. This is one of at least a dozen that I know of throughout this country. I think it is most unfortunate if we play into the hands of the white segregationists and end up with a new policy of separatism in education.

DESEGREGATION PRACTICES IN THE HARTFORD SCHOOLS

Alfred Rogers
President of the Hartford, Connecticut
Board of Education

Connecticut is unique in a sense. A percentage of its population has been Negro ever since the inception of the state. In 1787, a Negro barber in Hartford petitioned the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut seeking equal educational opportunities for black youngsters within the state. The General Assembly adopted a resolution guaranteeing equal education for all its citizens, black as well as white.

Hartford really represents the American city in microcosm. While it is a small city both in population (162,000) and in land area, 18 square miles, it has all of the problems common to every major city in this country. We have a sizeable section designated as a disadvantaged area, which is a polite euphemism for Negro ghetto. We are surrounded by a ring of relatively wealthy suburbs. If we are different from some large cities in any particular way, it is probably in terms of the capital wealth available from industry, and in the caliber and dedication of the leadership people working to solve the city's problems. This includes a dynamic chamber of commerce, a very active Urban League, and many responsive, creative city agencies.

As an agent of the state, the Hartford Board of Education works closely with all these city groups. As for our schools, we have a total school enrollment of 27,747, of which 44.5 percent are Negro, 11 percent are Puerto Rican, and 44.5 are white. They are presently housed in three high schools and 24 elementary schools. Some of the elementary school districts are as much as 90 percent Negro in their composition. We are by the very percentage make-up of our total school population faced with road-blocks in providing a quality integrated education. Yet, this is one of our major goals and one toward which we are making some definite progress.

We are also faced with other problems. More than one out of every four of our elementary school pupils comes from a broken home. An additional 600 children are not living with either parent. In our 24 elementary school districts, there are over 10,000 youngsters whose families are on state welfare or have Aid to Dependent Children. In addition, there are almost 2,000 more school-age children from families that receive city welfare payments. Combined, these total nearly half of our public school enrollment. Hartford school enrollment is 4.4 percent of the public school enrollment in all Connecticut schools. Yet the number of children in families receiving ADC payments in Hartford is more than 27 percent of all the ADC cases in Connecticut. Last year our school social workers handled some 3,000 cases. Our social work staff could be doubled and tripled and keep busy helping youngsters with serious family, educational and personal problems.

Mobility of our school population averages nearly 40 percent for all Hartford schools. In one school it runs as high as 64 percent. This means that in a school with 1,000 pupils enrolled in September, by the following June 640 pupils of the original 1,000 have either been replaced by others or have bounced out of school and back again, sometimes three or four times as the family moves around in the ghetto. The percentage of substandard housing runs as high as 58.2 percent in one of Hartford's districts.

The last United States census showed that the city-wide average of adults with eighth grade or less schooling, ran 46.1 percent, with some districts running as high as 70 percent. An estimate for 1967 indicates that the city-wide average of adults whose education has been no more than grade school or less approaches 80 to 85 percent in some districts.

During the most recently reported five-year period, some 68,000 people, or almost half the population of Hartford, moved out of the city limits, largely to the suburbs, and were replaced to a great extent by families of lower economic status. If welfare records are an accurate index, the families coming in during the past five years have been largely economically depressed. Typically, these families bring into Hartford more school-age children per family than those who move out. Typically, too, the children in the new families bring more educational problems with them, reflected in lower levels of achievement, serious language disabilities and adjustment problems. The run-down areas and the substandard, crowded dwellings into which the families move do not provide the proper environment for educational growth.

Parents, caught in the trap of inadequate education and meager vocational training, cannot look forward with much hope to improving their lives. The children inevitably reflect the hopelessness of the parental outlook. Their motivation is poor, their self-image is twisted, and their self-confidence is lost. You can readily see that in dealing with the problem of racial isolation or segregation, call it what you will, we are not faced with one neat, easily packaged problem, but with a host of intertwined and closely inter-related problems.

Last March the Hartford Public Schools sponsored an invitational conference on equal educational opportunities in the cities and brought together some 100 urban educators from across the nation to consider the complex problems of racial imbalance in the schools. From that conference came eight major items of general consensus:

One, it is now up to educators to set public policy in the field of social justice. This is a new and uncomfortable role, for policy in the past has been set by other agencies.

Two, the conference said yes to these two fundamental questions: (1) Do we wish to educate the Negro child to have a choice of social mobility? (2) Do we wish to educate the white child for life in a multi-racial society?

The third position was a conclusion that was reached that the early years of a child's life are the most crucial ones for social change, yet these are the most segregated years.

The fourth position, there must be something worthwhile at the end of the busline for children, a status and quality education in the city's educational park or suburban schools, meaningful relationships between children and parents, integration, not just desegregation.

The fifth conclusion, there is no one solution to the problems of racial imbalance in schools. Integration with compensatory education increases the potential for progress.

The sixth conclusion, we need a massive commitment on the part of many people. We need urban-suburban cooperation. We need regional solutions. We must involve the entire community including the other Americans, white or black, from the inner-city.

The seventh point, all children profit with progress for minority groups. When we prescribe for the educational ills of any child we help all children.

The eighth and final point, the goal is not to impose middle-class values on the Negro. It is to provide a quality education for all.

In the Hartford public schools, we have taken these eight areas of consensus to heart and are attempting to create programs and devise plans which will translate them into effective action. In some instances our efforts had even preceded the findings of the conference that we held. We speak in Hartford of quality education being integrated education and generally combine terms by referring to it as "quality integrated education."

However, I would not want you to conclude from this that we are so preoccupied with the problems of integration to the exclusion of everything else. This is not true. Quite the contrary is true and I do not have time to describe the host of programs we conduct which are not necessarily related specifically to integration. The best evidence of this may be found in a booklet recently published by the United States Office of Education in which 10 programs were selected nationally as exemplifying the kinds of practices and studies which have resulted in the improvement of educational opportunities for disadvantaged children and which have been particularly effective in bringing about pupil change.

Of these 10 programs from across the nation, we are proud that two are selected from the Hartford Public Schools. My point is that of these two, one deals with intensive reading instructional teams, and while it does help children of minority groups, it is not aimed specifically at integration. It is typical of many other Hartford programs.

The second program selected by the U. S. Office is Project Concern, and this is specifically aimed at solving problems which are the direct result of racial isolation as well as poverty and cultural deprivation. Begun in 1966, Project Concern is now nearing the end of its second year of operation. A token experiment numerically, Project Concern has far reaching implications. Among its purposes are: to assess the range of academic growth that takes place when the typical disadvantaged child of the city is placed in suburban schools where expectations of learning are high and to demonstrate the operational feasibility of urban-suburban collaboration in such a program.

In this, its second year, some 200 native Hartford children ride the buses that fan out to 35 public schools in five suburbs. The children scatter to 131 elementary classrooms at the end of the bus line. Children were picked by a random process, one of the features that attracts attention to the Hartford study. These are children whose parents' aspirations might not have placed them in volunteer busing programs. So it is not a question of Negro parents volunteering to send their youngsters to the program. The youngsters, mainly Negro, come from five Hartford schools that are deeply segregated, and there lives reflect all the problems typically associated with inner-city poverty. Their reactions, their parents' reactions and the attitudes of suburban pupils and parents have dispelled a number of the early fears expressed for the project.

Project Concern children have help from teachers who go out from the city with them and from mothers serving as aides. For each 25 children there is one supporting teacher and one aide. For purposes of comparison, a few of the pupils go to suburban schools without this support.

Results of tests and evaluations of the Project thus far show the following: (1) At five of the six grade levels children bused to the suburbs gain more in intelligence and achievement than children staying in Hartford. (2) The chances for significant gain are increased threefold for those who are bused. (3) Attendance of bused children is above the state average for elementary school youngsters. (4) Parental participation in suburban school programs exceeded 90 percent in the year 1966-67. In other words, more than 90 percent of the parents of the youngsters bused in to the suburbs participated in parental activities in the suburbs. (5) Pupil participation in after-school activities in the suburbs exceeded 60 percent. (6) Teachers report significant and positive changes in pupil behavior over the year. In other words, a youngster who may have had difficulty with his behavior during the first part of the year is apparently assimilated at the conclusion of the year as far as his actions are concerned with the rest of the group. (7) There is no evidence of negative psychological impact upon participants nor is there evidence of any social isolation in the north end. In other words, when the youngster goes back into the ghetto, he is not isolated by his peers. (8) There is no evidence that academic performance in suburban classes has been negatively influenced by having Project Concern pupils in a class.

Federal funds have been the principle source of financing Project Concern up to now. Project Concern has had a non-governmental grant of $50,000 from the Ford Foundation as well. Major expenses, which include tuition payments to the cooperating towns were drawn from Title I and III of ESEA and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. The Hartford School System contributed approximately $80,000 to the experiment by providing the supporting teachers.

Next year with the end of federal funds, Hartford will provide the major cost of the continuation of this program. In fact the results of this project have been so encouraging, that the Hartford Board of Education has voted the funds necessary to expand it to serve 700 youngsters in the fall of 1968. Additional suburban towns are making plans to receive some of our youngsters, and some nearby private schools also have indicated a desire to participate.

A summary of Project Concern's growth shows that it began in September of 1966 with 266 Hartford children attending schools in five suburban towns. This cooperation continued in 1967 and stimulated the Catholic elementary schools of West Hartford and Manchester to invite some 50 children from Hartford Public Schools to attend their classes. While not a part of Project Concern, except for the sharing of the buses, this venture has a similar spirit and design.

In the 1968-69 school year, the public school enrollment in Project Concern will expand to 700. The Catholic counterpart will continue, and, as I indicated, several private schools are anxious to be included. We feel that Project Concern provides, on a small scale, partial solution to de facto segregation. We feel it can be implemented immediately if communities wish to do so. It preserves the local autonomy for each school district and depends upon specific contractual agreements for operation. It costs a cooperating suburb no money. In fact, suburbs get both a tuition payment and added professional services. Operational costs on a per pupil basis estimated for a large scale program are between $1,000 and $1,100 per pupil. This figure is consistent with costs for intensive compensatory programs and includes the cost of transportation.

Within the city of Hartford, we have taken a number of carefully considered measures to increase opportunities for a quality integrated education. Our superintendent has proposed that Hartford Public Schools align themselves with the suburban schools in fashioning within the inner-city itself a counterpart to Project Concern. The evidence is clear. Supportive teacher and aide service inherent in the operation of Project Concern more than compensates for the addition of several pupils to a classroom. Thus, the proposal is that any Hartford school containing 10 percent or fewer non-white pupils receive at least 25 pupils, grades one through four, from underprivileged areas. Each group of 25 pupils should have the support and assistance of one teacher and one teacher aide.

Scheduled for implementation beginning September of 1968, this inner-city counterpart of Project Concern, accompanied by an expansion of regular Project Concern operations, offers genuine hope for a modest but definite advance toward quality education for an increasing number of minority children and majority children as well.

We have also approved that open enrollment policy for grades one through seven. Essentially, the plan as conceived was to achieve more desirable racial balance and more workable class size within limits created by increased enrollment throughout the system, classes determined oversize were balanced with those declared undersize. A complete and verified list of undersize classes as well as a specific number of openings in each school was made available to parents, who then were given an opportunity to request transfers of their children.

In selecting students to be transferred, first priority was to be given to students in schools with greatly overcrowded grade levels and to students in the more seriously oversized classes. If a tie had resulted, a public drawing would have been held and the students selected in the drawing would have been the ones transferred. The plan having started midway in the school year and having posed difficult transportation problems for interested parents has so far only met with modest response.

Another effort we have made is to create several so-called "bridge" schools, in which by careful redistricting, we are attempting to maintain a racial balance at least equal to that of the city average.

Recognizing the crucial role of the teachers in attacking urban problems, we are reaching out in many directions to provide our staff with opportunities to improve their understanding and skills in working with urban children. This we consider very important. This past summer, the Hartford Public Schools drew with the University of Hartford a program called Hartford Intensive City University Teacher Training (Operation Hi-Cut), designed to stimulate urban teacher training into an on-going cooperative responsibility. The University of Hartford is a privately endowed institution, so here we have also inherent in this type of program governmental-private cooperation in shooting at some of the problems of the private city. In Hi-Cut, future teachers, new teachers and experienced Hartford teachers were teamed to analyze and appraise critically those attitudes and concerns as they affect the urban child. Approximately 500 Hartford public and parochial school pupils were the vehicle for achieving the objectives of this teacher-training program.

One of the major forces in urban-pupil behavior, the search for self-identification was recognized early and met with some imaginative approaches. Devices were incorporated into the curriculum which highlighted and improved the status of each child. Every child was recognized as being self-important and necessary to the total success of the group. On the first day of the program, each child was greeted with a colorful tag on which his name had been inserted previously. How nice to be known to everyone. Nearly every room had a mirror and pupils took turns to study themselves. They talked with the teacher about color, appearance and expression while developing the concept that all children are alike, but different. They drew self-portraits and tape-recorded their own descriptions. Each artist's name was prominent on his portrait. Each picture was displayed. Each pupil became important. Autobiographies were written and illustrated with the author's photograph. Again each autobiography was placed on the bulletin board, properly identified. Each pupil's personal background became important. Pictures of the family unit and the neighborhood were also encouraged. Again names, again display, again discussion. Each pupil's family, each pupil's neighborhood, each pupil's experiences became important. The "me" emerged and was recognized and approved by teacher, pupil and the class.

I could go on in describing specific ways in which Hartford is developing its educational program to reduce and eventually irradicate racial segregation. I could talk about our administrators who attended an NDEA institute in teaching the culturally disadvantaged child and came back to Hartford to conduct a three-month program of sensitivity training for 36 inner-city teachers. I could dwell for a while on our pioneering with work-study programs with high schools. There are 91 different special programs, all aimed at providing quality integrated education.

Let me close, however, with a few words on our building program and eventual school district organization. At the time when Hartford stood at the cross roads of urban renewal, it also realized that it had to embark on a school renewal plan. Certain points of direction were taken from the Center for Field Studies of the Harvard Graduate School of

2

Education. In many key respects, however, Hartford made its own modifications. A $44 million bond issue was passed to support the beginning of a building program, eventually totaling over $100 million. This was not an effort that was necessarily boosted by federal participation. This was a city effort. Urban renewal funds would assist in this ambitious effort. On "a six-two-four" organizational pattern, Phase One of the building program consists of the building of three middle schools for grades seven and eight, two elementary schools, and one new high school. The plans for these buildings have been finalized and construction will begin this summer.

Meanwhile, we have presented to the City Council our Phase Two Plans, which include a very dramatic proposal for a university educational park. This calls for the construction of a 1600-pupil middle school for grades five through eight and a 2600-pupil high school, nine through 12, on a site immediately adjacent to our Annie Fisher Elementary School and the University of Hartford. The university will cooperate in the planning of the park's program, will use the park as a lab for the training of teachers for urban schools and will afford use of university facilities and staff for special needs of our public school students. The advantage as far as integration is concerned is that such a large complex can draw students from diverse geographic areas of our community, thus affording opportunities for integration, and at earlier grade levels than is possible with smaller neighborhood schools. This university educational park concept will probably be expanded in Hartford.

We are considering the superintendent's recommendation to divide the city into three districts, each approximately equal in enrollment and in ethnic composition, each with its own high school, middle school and feeder-elementary school, each with its own budget administered by an assistant and associate superintendent. Each district would work cooperatively with a university or consortium of colleges and universities in the planning and implementation of the educational program and the training of professional personnel to work in urban schools.

We foresee the possibility that our program will be exciting enough to attract cooperative relationships with suburban communities as we have already accomplished in Project Concern. This, of course, will enhance the probability of greater integrated educational experiences for our youngsters. It may even attract back to our city some of the middle-class white population which has been moving out in recent years.

I would hope that from our remarks today you have drawn the conclusion that we in Hartford regard the war on segregation as one which must be fought on many fronts, involving many different battles and requiring a varied arsenal of techniques and plans. It is, however, not just a battle against a social evil. It is also a fight for the conditions of mind and spirit which will permit all people to work and play and live together, regardless of race, creed or color.

As our superintendent of schools has said, "The solution to the problem of quality integrated education must be solved on a broader base than that of a single school district. It will involve other school districts, other governmental units, including local, state and federal, and also many other types of things, including the church and the home."

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE UNDERPRIVILEGED

Dr. George W. Jones
Specialist in Urban Education
National Education Association

I am not necessarily convinced that compensatory education programs are the approaches to that which we think we want. In the past five years, there has been an intense concentration of effort in the area of compensatory education. These have sprung up, dramatically sometimes, in practically every urban center in this country. Increasingly our school systems have been spending larger and larger sums of money, providing more special programs and special personnel and devoting more attention to the problems of education of the economically and educationally disadvantaged.

In California, for example, statewide effort has been extended, and under the McAtler Act, special additional funds are provided for local school districts for new programs for the disadvantaged. The big foundations have contributed generously to this trend. In 1965, the Ford Foundation, for example, granted more than $1 million to the Pittsburgh school system alone. In 1965, also, the United States Congress recognized that there was a problem by providing more than three quarters of a billion dollars exclusively to the programs of compensatory education administered by local public school systems under Title I of ESEA. As a matter of record, the Federal Government has spent a little more than $4 billion in less than four years to help schools raise to a better quality the education of the disadvantaged. They should have spent more than $50 billion, but there was the expenditure of at least $4 billion.

In addition to the money spent, there have been many other things going on. Dramatization of the condition of the urban disadvantaged is now widespread. Just a few weeks ago, the presidential advisory commission on civil disorders in the cities made its initial report. The shock waves of that report are still reverberating across the country. Major communications networks have scheduled programs dealing with the special problems of education in inner cities. There have been Congressional hearings concerning poverty and the serious effects it has had on the education of children and youth. Newspaper and magazine articles are legion concerning the problem. Books have been published by the score and any cursory examination of educational research reveals voluminous studies on the educational problems of the disadvantaged. We are up to our eyeballs in the pathology of the cities.

Yet, in spite of the financial support, in spite of the tremendous publicity, in spite of all of the research, compensatory education programs have not done what was expected. Urban education in America in my judgment is a dismal failure. There are many reasons to expect that urban schools will continue to fail for some time. Money allocated for the purpose of aiding the disadvantaged often winds up on the established line in the budget where maximum expenditure accomplishes minimum results. Most compensatory programs are aimed at helping students catch up to some very minimal standards rather than seeking optimal performance. The money spent does not begin to make up for the inequalities of the expenditures of the past nor of the present. Overwhelming bureaucratic and administrative roadblocks impede significant experimentation or innovation. And then too, the people who run these programs have not changed.

Perhaps most important of all, most disadvantaged students still fail because we ask them to change to fit the school definition of achievement rather than ask the schools to change to serve these students. Secondly, substandard performance is expected of these students in spite of the highest proclamations of the so-called liberals to the contrary. It has been demonstrated over and over again that expectation of substandard performance virtually insures substandard performance. We do not believe they can do it; therefore, they do not. Looking at this one way, one might be led to say that the urban school system is designed to assure failure. The McComb Commission, appointed by former Gov. Edmund G. Brown to investigate the Watts riot in Los Angeles spelled this out very clearly. In examining schools in the Negro area of Los Angeles, the commission reported it found severe overcrowding, fewer qualified teachers, fewer sensitive, responsive administrators, older school buildings and lack of cafeterias, libraries and many other deficiencies. The report added: "It appears that the average student in the fifth grade in schools in the disadvantaged areas is unable to read and understand a daily newspaper or to make use of reading and writing for ordinary purposes in his daily life. The degree of illiteracy seriously impairs his ability to profit from further schooling."

This finding can hardly be categorized as news to anybody familiar with achievement records in the poor areas in major cities in this country. In New York City, for example, with its highly touted MES program, in Detroit, in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Chicago, in Washington with its Model Schools Program, even in Pittsburgh, which may well be the national leader in terms of scope and quality of compensatory education efforts, the figures are depressingly similar. Let us look at some of these statistics, boring and depressing as they may be.

In central Harlem section of New York City, 21.6 percent of the 3rd grade students are reading above grade level, but 30 percent are reading below grade level. By the 6th grade, 11.7 percent of students are reading above grade level, and a full 80 percent are reading below grade level. In arithmetic, central Harlem students are one and one-half years behind the rest of the city and the nation by the 6th grade and two years behind by the 8th grade. Similar stories can be told for Los Angeles, where the 5th-grade achievement level so astounded and alarmed the McComb Commission, for Chicago where 6th-grade achievement levels in the seven most heavily Negro ghetto districts are more than one and one-half years below that of the seven least severely Negro districts. It seems to me difficult to believe that anybody in touch with reality could deny that our big city school systems have consistently failed and are still failing miserably to educate low-income urban groups, particularly low-incomed Negroes.

Here are some of the identifiable problems of the so-called compensatory education programs in our schools, as I see them. These programs attempt to compensate for the inadequacies of the student rather than for the inadequacies of the school. They invest too little per student to make a real difference in individual progress. They are poorly designed by poor designers. They are too often merely attempts to take the pressure off the schools. They buy more of the same wrong techniques that put the child behind in the first place. There is little or no scholarly evidence which shows that they work under their present structure, and there is certainly no evidence to show that they work well. I know we are going to get a lot of flak about that.

Let me quickly add here that in discussing the shortcomings of large urban public school systems and their inadequate compensatory programs, I have no desire to ignore the many shortcomings which infuse almost all American public education, urban, suburban, town, county, rural. I certainly do not wish to imply, as is sometimes done, that only if slum kids could get the kind of education available to the bedroom communities of this nation, all their problems would be over. The city must share in at least equal measure the many current weaknesses in public education in this country, its authoritarianism, the mis-education of its teachers, its misuse as an agent for imposing a majority culture on the richly diverse and significant culture of minority groups which make up this nation. I do not accept the statement that they are culturally deprived. It is the development of a school culture that is hostile and harmful to the children, its unreceptivity to experimentation, its timidity in seeking a larger share of the overwhelming and overflowing wealth of this country for educational purposes.

The inner-city schools represent a specific situation of extreme failure within the context of general inadequacy in American public education. Then too, one of the serious shortcomings of urban education is based on the fact that public school policies have given little recognition to the changing nature of the American population. The schools have not adjusted their curricula, their teaching methods, their programs, their institutional idols to the changing needs brought on by the changing nature of the population.

Let us look for a moment at the way in which this environment has drastically changed and which should have had, but did not have, profound effect on the schools. In 1910 less than one half of the population in this country lived in urban areas of 2,500 or more. Today, 80 percent of Americans live in great city complexes. In 1910, 81 percent of all black Americans lived in the rural areas of the South. Today, nearly 80 percent of Negro Americans live in cities mostly in the North. The population movement continues, and even if poverty and discrimination were not involved, the population itself would create severe social problems.

Unfortunately, poverty and discrimination are involved in the rush to the cities. These new city dwellers seek to grasp the American Dream but very few institutions or individuals are willing to reach out and help them. Instead of an attitudinal posture of being concerned about providing more classrooms and more teachers for the same style of education we used to have in the so-called good old days, schools today should engage in a spirit of massive reformation. The first step would be to destroy, eliminate, abolish, get rid of the rigid school bureaucracies which fail to raise and use resources in a manner responsive to the needs, the background, the aspirations of the communities they serve. I insist that they are not doing this.

Teachers, dedicated, highly trained as they may be, are ill-prepared, either emotionally or intellectually, to teach in the inner-cities. Students, treated as pieces of children rather than as individual human beings, reject not only what is taught but tune out who is doing the teaching. Parents feeling alienated and not a part of the school system, become embittered as a result of their frustrations.

I see a brighter picture for tomorrow. I see a movement away from the winter of despair to the spring of hope. Several suggestions have been made on avenues of approaches to solutions of our urban education problem. I should like to take a look at several of these proposals without recommending to you either of them as being more feasible or applicable than the others.

Dr. Kenneth Clark, President of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center of New York City and one of the most eminent and respected scholars in the area of urban education, has suggested that public schools have failed because they are inefficient. Let us listen to what he has to say about the way out of our dilemma: "The first step in any serious plan of educational reform has to include attempts at increasing the efficiency of the existing public school system. This cannot be done however by demonstration programs, enrichment programs, compensatory programs or other types of piecemeal gimmicks. Serious solutions must be sought in terms of wide-spread reorganization of existing school systems. Included in such reorganizational plans must be specific concerns with such matters as curricula, methods of teaching, teachers, selection of assistant principals, selection of principals, assistant superintendents, superintendents, and the quality of school board personnel. Probably the most crucial component of any major reorganization plan is the complex problem of developing machinery for direct accountability of the educational personnel to responsible groups in the immediate and the larger community. Such accountability must be in terms of the academic achievement of the students. We should think in terms," says Dr. Clark, "of regional public school organization that would cut across urban and suburban lines and include children in regional emphasis and/or the development of a federal public school system which would parallel present local schools."

A somewhat similar proposal has been advanced by Dr. Harvey Presman of the Educational Development Center of Newton, Mass. Dr. Presman suggests the development of new, privately managed, parallel inner schools, which can demonstrate with high visibility that children of the inner-city poor when properly taught can learn. He would like to see considerably increased amounts of the federal, state, local and private moneys now being spent invested in the first stages of a national network of independent, privately managed inner-city schools.

Both the Clark and the Presman plans, assume that the competition provided by these parallel schools would be healthy in that they would cause the local public schools to begin a movement toward change. But most important for them and all those who are like them is the possibility for the development, trials and demonstration on a massive scale of novel experiments and innovations in education which are not now possible for local school administrators.

There are several other designs for new schools for urban areas, educational parks, metropolitan area schools, and so on. I would like to mention three that I think might have some areas for profitable discussion. One, is a community education center which would develop a community-centered curriculum through the use of the community as a reservoir of work experiences, giving employees in the community some voice in curriculum planning and utilizing them for student work-study experiences.

The second kind of program is known as the "moon shot" program, the kind suggested by Dr. Frank Riesman in 1965. Dr. Riesman maintained that the schools of most existing educational programs for the children in the urban areas are quite low. Dr. Riesman proposes that it is time to consider not the piecemeal use of this technique or of that technique, but the combination in a massive thrust of a variety of approaches that work on both a practical and a theoretical basis to produce dramatic, powerful improvements in large numbers of disadvantaged youngsters.

The third design was proposed by Dr. Charles Hamilton of Roosevelt University. Styling himself as an alienated reformer, Dr. Hamilton in a recent speech in Washington, D.C., said that he was less interested in integration as a primary goal and more concerned with the nature of the quality of education in its indigenous setting. Identifying himself with the black-power movement, Dr. Hamilton has proposed what he calls a new kind of family-community-school plan. I should like to read sections of his speech to you. "Let us stop thinking of school and education as being solely child-oriented. It must be family-oriented. Let us stop thinking of school as something for children alone from 9 to 3, September to June, with time off in the summer for good behavior. It must be a year-round affair. We should erect the school as a center of the particular community we are dealing with. It should be the principal focal point of that community, academically, recreationally, vocationally, healthwise, public welfarewise. The entire family should be oriented to it. Educational instruction should be available to all in the family and the community, pre-school to 88.

"I mean more," said Dr. Hamilton, "than simply adult education classes in the evening. We should abolish the demeaning public welfare system method and collapse it with a community educational system. Why can't the ADC mother receive assistance through the school mechanism? Why can't we stop the utterly chaotic system whereby 5 to 10 separate agencies zero in on a single family, none working in coordination with the other. I would construct a family-school plan," says Dr. Hamilton, "that would contain a community health clinic, massive recreational programs. I would make the local parents an integral part of the government of such an institution. The parents would be partners with the professionals, the administrators, the teachers, the social workers, the psychiatrists. I would build into such a plan the important component of inter-reaction with other communities. We would build a curriculum which would recognize the history and heritage of black constituents. I would recognize that for far too long public education sought to socialize its pupils into a particular western, middle-class mentality which required black people to deny their culture in order to become human beings."

You may wish to reject Dr. Hamilton's plan totally or in part, but for Dr. Hamilton and thousands like him, this movement is growing with such intensity that we had better begin to look at it. For these people this kind of program is a restoration of faith. It is a move from systematic alienation to meaningful participation. Through this kind of approach it is hoped and believed that people will take new pride in themselves as individual human beings and find meaning in their lives. School will take on a new meaning. It will be something for people, done with them, not to them. Education will mean something other than texts, tests, teachers and tyrants. This kind of proposal is predicated on the proposition that before a group can enter the open society, it must first close its own ranks. The educational system, therefore, becomes a vehicle for a comprehensive process of Americanization.

You may or may not feel comfortable with this or with any of the so-called new designs for providing relevant education for children in the urban centers of this nation. You may wish to argue that these plans are not really new at all, but simply variations on a long-played tune. Some of you may want to conclude that it is really too soon to conclude one thing or another about the efficacy of compensatory education. You may say all the data may not be in. We simply have not had time to draw valid conclusions.

On the other hand, we think there is sufficient data. I think there is sufficient data and enough relevant evidence to at least point to where we are and where we need to go and suggest that what we are doing is not what is needed. I am suggesting that we take a more serious look at our commitments, our objectives, our dreams, and our hopes for the future and then work together in mutual respect and in love to bind up our nation's wounds in order to move more rapidly from the winter of despair to the spring of hope.

A LARGE URBAN DISTRICT WORKS ON COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Dr. Louis Monacel
Assistant Superintendent for Program Development
Detroit Public Schools

I will begin by quoting the Superintendent of Detroit Public Schools, Dr. Norman Drachler. He describes compensatory education in similar fashion to Mark Twain's Platte River--"a mile wide and an inch deep." Nationally, I don't think we have done what is expected. We just do not have the money. I think the state has too long ignored the differential in city school systems as opposed to the urban areas. With that in mind, I think you should know that we have not done what is expected with ESEA, with OEO, in the direction of academic achievement. I think we have created some excellent models, but all they are indeed are models. I think all the plans that Dr. Jones has mentioned are completely acceptable to the Detroit public schools if we can implement them. Some of them we have implemented in one direction or another.

I think the scene in our urban area in Michigan is so desperate that the Detroit school district has indeed sued the state government as an only alternative to the fiscal dilemma that urban education in Michigan, through Detroit, is suffering. We do not have the money to do the job. We cannot count on what is coming from the federal government to do anything more than produce the models that I will speak to a little later. Compensatory education before the '50's was and remains meaningful. Compensatory education when you talk to a handicapped child, a cardiac child, a deaf child, that kind of compensatory education provides up to $2,500 per year per pupil. When we talk about compensatory education for urban youngsters, for Negro youngsters, for black youngsters, we are talking about $40, $50, a $100, maybe $200 expended per child in addition to the tax base of the school system. That is really the root cause of really not making the difference. Detroit can announce failure since 1964, with the advent of OEO and ESEA, if we only look at the record in the direction of academic achievement. Our citizens, to a faretheewell, have learned our data collection practices, have learned our research practices and are giving our data back to us. It is data that clearly shows in the black communities in Detroit that we are not achieving in reading, writing and computational skills at the rate we should.

I do not think large urban school systems want to deny the rich culture to the minority groups, and yet I for one, as an educator and as an educator in Detroit most of my career, know really no alternative to moving children in the direction of the middle-class affluent society. I have yet to find a different route. It seems to me the route that the militants in Detroit are looking for, whether it is self-determination or a more moderate view, is still aiming in the direction of an affluent society.

Detroit's compensatory program I like to think of as caused not by public education, not by federal government, not state boards of education, and not state legislators. It was stirred by Civil Rights legislation and court decisions. That movement, a movement with urgency, a movement of immediacy, I think forcefully twisted the arms of all of us in public education, particularly those in urban education. I do not think we invented new approaches to education through the federal government and decent state legislation. I think we were forced to and rightfully so.

Unfortunately, educators were as complacent as all the rest of the citizens. All of us needed to be nudged. We were nudged. But we, I think, began in the late '50's, with the Ford Foundation's help to build a model in just a few schools, a model with the slogan perhaps of trying to make it different in the lives of children, trying to make a magnificent difference with about 10 percent more expenditure than normal.

Some of the things we wanted to happen I think did happen. I think we did work with the teachers to the extent that the teachers were more commited and had higher expectation levels for children. Probably at least 50 percent of the curricular battle rests in the area of attitude and commitment. We did do a job there. Teachers in Detroit today, all 11,000 of them, can probably give great lip service at least to self-concept, commitment to high expectation levels. This obviously is not enough. In those days of Ford Foundation money, I think we had more committed teachers, better attitudes in the schools, less rigidity and less bureacratization of the schools, but really no teaching act differences in those classrooms. Therefore, I think we have to submit that it is critical that a teacher is committed and a believer in the worth of all. It is equally critical that the believer-teacher knows how to teach--the teaching act that indeed does the job.

When we look at the achievement tests, we have had difficulty measuring whether or not a child is believing in himself. But I submit that a child cannot believe in himself if he cannot read properly, he cannot compute properly, no matter what he is told about himself. I think the Great Cities Project, under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, built the legislative history for the Economic Opportunity Act.

The OEO, of course, cannot be looked upon as an opportunity from 1964 until this date to make major changes in the school system, because the nature of the legislation was such that all the educational components had to be appendages peripheral to the daily summer programs for children, which was good. We had to develop remediation and enrichment activities after school. There was no way to use these monies in the daily life of the child.

But in 1965 I discovered Lansing because Lansing discovered ESEA, particularly in Title I. We then started our techniques to get Detroit its fair share of Title I compensatory education money, and with the help of state people, developed perhaps 13 or 14 models, approaches to education applicable to disadvantaged areas.

We continued to maintain after-school activities for children. We continued to maintain and nurture a community school approach in the inner-city urban areas. I too believe that the school should be fully utilized, not for evening adult education, but as the hub of the community. All the researchers and other agencies of Detroit should fit and blend and coordinate on the basis of the local school, particularly of the local elementary schools.

I have said earlier we have not made any significant gains, unless you want to look at the local, heroic, individual schools here and there with a great staff and a great principal and a school that understands the interaction procedures of the community. Here we will find sometimes startling gains in achievement. I think in Detroit, however, we do not believe in heroics as the only answer. I think there has to be a systematized approach to make a substantial significant gain for children.

We have done, probably a better job in other directions than we have done in the achievement area. For example, because of the nature of categorical aid under OEO and sometimes the nature of the guidelines for Title I, school systems have pushed themselves in new directions.

For instance, Detroit is one of the few cities in America whose board was brave enough to recognize that we have a responsibility to girls who have left school because they are pregnant. This is a program under Title I where we maintain and continue the academic education of pregnant girls in sites away from the school section. Work-study programs under Title I and under the Labor Department have been fairly successful, absolutely successful in terms of retaining students in the secondary schools. Kids who have jobs, who have individual guidance and counseling, tend to remain in school and be more punctual. Their marks seem to improve. During the civil disorders last summer we had something like 2,000 high school kids in work-study programs attached to the school. None of them was involved in the disorders. Eight of them were involved to the extent of violating curfew. This in itself says something for the work-study approach.

Detroit, lately, without federal money, is beginning to find that big business and big industry are much more willing to bring their staff, their experts, their knowledge and their money to some of our schools to work with us in the whole business of job achievement and academic achievement. I do not think big industry is all that brave. I think they are scared. Big industry must base its operations on the fate of an urban center. Then, out of sheer fear, we are beginning to get the kind of coordination with business and industry that we must have and should have had for the past 20 years.

Probably one of the most significant results of OEO and Title I in our city, at least in my opinion, is the beginning development of para-professional approaches in the public schools. In Detroit there are over 2,500 para-professional doing teacher aide work, clerical help in offices, doing work in the community under the auspices of the school. This is probably one of the most significant developments, I think, under the federal program. This means that 2,500 otherwise somewhat alienated people from the schools are now working in the schools, getting paid for working in the schools and they are beginning to have some understanding of the nature of the schools. Many of them are becoming the community watchdogs to make sure that the schools operate as they should operate. I must admit that many principals in our schools do not exactly believe in the para-professionals for this very purpose. But I would hope someday that every teacher has at her disposal several technicians from the community to help in the teaching-learning act. In fact, in Detroit the union members are believers in para-professionals to the extent that para-professionals are now a part of the two-year contract with the board of education to the tune of at least one teacher aide for ten teachers at this point.

Probably the other most significant outcome of compensatory approaches to education in Detroit has been the realization of citizen involvement that has come about through the pressures brought to bear by federal programs in the school system. We have to remember that all school systems are bureaucratic, and federal programs are not absolutely popular in all quarters of the school system because along with the federal programs come certain things you have to do--mainly involvement, real involvement, meaningful involvement with the local citizenry. Many of us are not exactly enchanted at this point with that kind of involvement. This outcome is probably the most hopeful outcome for the future.

I do not want the thought of McGeorge Bundy's decentralization plan and the implications of that for a school board. But I do think that developing in Detroit is much more responsibility by the local school to its community. There are many, many areas in our city where policy-making advisory bodies do not exist, helping to determine the fate of the curriculum and the policies of that local school. I think an extension of this in Detroit will be some approach to regionality of citizen participation in our schools, participation I think not at the advisory level but participation at the educational policy-making level. I do not know of any alert citizen anymore who buys the advisory route. As good as PTA movements have been, I think this concept is dissipating in Detroit in the inner cities, and new groups, new participants, are now involved in the schools with a completely different concept. I think a more hopeful practice, the work study approach, is applicable to Detroit. I could not spend the time to pin point the activities in Detroit that seem to speak for this plan. Dr. Riesman's plan was not clear to me in terms of implementation. Dr. Hamilton's plan with the significance of the year-round operation and the coordination of efforts, I wholeheartedly support.

The newest developments in Detroit I think are probably the most helpful. An area in Detroit, a geographic area that holds some 35,000 citizens and some 25,000 children in approximately 25 schools, is designated a federal Neighborhood Service Program area, one of 14 such areas in the United States. The Detroit public schools are heavily involved in this geographic area in the city. In this area, we will have one final opportunity to take another look at compensatory education, another look in the direction of coordinating all moneys that come into Detroit from State Aid Acts, under Section 4 in Michigan, and under Titles I, II, III, and other titles of federal programs and place with a deliberate skew, much of our funds into this one area. We can for once end the diffusion of the money that really makes for inch-deep efforts rather than mile-deep efforts, to see what can happen if we concentrate and coordinate all available federal monies in this one area and build some real model schools. Our kickoff for this area was a Title III kickoff. The Detroit public schools a few weeks ago received, I guess, the largest Title III grant so far, $6 million for use over a period of three years to be spent in the direction of creating five model schools in this area. Now those models were, I think, attempting to meet the stated needs of educators in these size schools. Class size will be reduced to 22 pupils with the opportunity for teachers to work with groups as small as three or four children at a time. We are building in curricular supervisory people in fairly great numbers in each of these schools. We are building in permanent policy making citizen advisory groups, important to these schools, which will be tied in with the total community citizen policy governing board groups for the entire neighborhood. All agencies who come into this neighborhood with federal programs will have to report directly in terms of policy to the citizen body. The citizen body in this case is 50 percent of the governing board. The remainder of the governing board are the various agency heads who have funded programs in the area.

In this area, at least, the community, I think, will be in the position to determine the fate of the public education in the neighborhood, to also determine the faith of all other agencies as they participate in this project. This is probably the model that Detroit public schools will look to as it trys to attempt some sort of decentralization. We feel that this then becomes a valuable way to go, that this will soon become the posture across the city of Detroit.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Al Shanker
President, New York City Federation of Teachers

My topic is not the eternal one of compensatory education, although I hope I will touch on some general items, but more specifically the More Effective School Plan of New York City.

The basic idea of the plan is a tremendous and overwhelming concentration of educational resources. It is based on the idea that if you go out and buy a bottle of gin and then drink it one eyedropper at a time, you have wasted your money. You might as well have got water and saved your money. Many of our educational programs when they are spread out that way have that sort of effect.

I am going to talk both in terms of program and in terms of the history of the program, because they are closely linked in terms of the controversy that still rages at the present time. In December, 1962, then Acting Superintendent of Schools Dr. Bernard Donovan, awaiting the arrival of Calvin Gross as superintendent, made a proposed budget for the Board of Education for the following year. In that proposed budget he advocated that a sum of $2 million be set aside so that 2,000 teachers teaching in predominantly white schools could be given a $1,000 bonus if they would transfer to predominantly black schools.

The Federation of Teachers held a series of meetings. Most of our teachers teach in ghetto schools. Our teachers, especially our ghetto school teachers, violently opposed the idea, and they labeled the concept "combat pay." It was the money that was being paid to teachers to endure impossible situations. It might attract some people. It would not change the conditions that make teachers refuse to accept positions in these schools or drive them out rather quickly. We were joined in this by all the civil rights groups, parents and newspapers.

A few weeks later, the superintendent of schools denied that he had made the proposal, even though it was made in writing to the board of education and more than 8,000 copies were sent to various groups.

We could have stopped at that point and said we had done a great job and patted ourselves on the back. We did not because we realized the problem the superintendent was pointing to--namely, the tremendous difficulty of staffing ghetto schools, the high turnover and the inexperience of teachers. The superintendent was trying to solve a real problem even though we thought he was trying to do it in the wrong way. Therefore, we felt the responsibility to come up with our own proposal.

We then asked a number of people--principals, psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors, teachers, parents and civic leaders--"If money were not the problem, what would you design?" They came back to us with a design called the Effective School Program. The program was based on a psychological hunch of Dr. Eliott Shapiro that ghetto children find it difficult to learn because they grow up very quickly. At a very early age, they are compelled to take responsibilities which middle-class children do not have to take until their teens. This kind of independence is contrary to the very definition of childhood. To be a child means to be dependent on some adult or adults. If you lose that dependence, with that loss also goes a loss of curiosity and comes a different type of functioning of the entire personality. The Effective School was to be designed as an environment in which children could develop a dependent relationship on an adult.

There was another concept also. We have spent millions and millions of additional dollars on education in each decade, in each two decades, in California, Michigan and New York. In most cases, all the money has gone to building up outside supportive services. If you walk into a classroom today, it is not too much different from what the classroom was 30 years ago, in spite of all the expenses. Outside the classroom we know we have audio-visual people, guidance counselors, psychologists and so forth. Inside the classroom we have not done very much. So the first emphasis was on a tremendous limitation in class size. We built in both things actually--a large outside facilities staff, but also a maximum of 22 children to a class with four teachers to three classes to work as a team. We also built in an emphasis on early childhood. The plan has an all-day pre-kindergarten, starting at three years of age. I say the plan has, but this part was not carried out. Neither were the summer schools. It also calls for a year-round program.

Along with these is a mandated program for heterogeneous groups. From the Coleman Report we are told that children learn more from each other than they do from their teachers or their books or from the how new or how old the school surroundings are. It is extremely important that we get a mix, not only a racial mix, but also a socio-economic mix. Coleman is talking about children with a higher vocabulary from the middle-class family sitting next to children from a not so high middle-class or a lower-class family in order to get a distribution of linguistic skills. You cannot have that kind of integration, that kind of mix, if you have a large class size.

That is one of the great short-comings of an educational park. If you brought 50,000 kids together and still had 30 to 35 in a class, I can tell you the first thing you would do. You would separate them according to ability, because the teachers themselves say that they cannot teach kids with this range of ability. The parents would say, "My child isn't learning because somebody is holding up the class." Children themselves start protesting in terms of not being able to get attention. In order to bring about integration, even where it is possible with an educational park or an integrated neighborhood, you are not to r esegregate within the school by all sorts of ability groupings. The limitation on class size is extremely important.

Yes, it is compensatory education, but it is a different kind of compensatory education. It is not the shallow kind, which you can hardly see. It is not the additional $10 to $50. It calls for a doubling of expenditures, say from $600 a child to $1200, which gives you quite an enrichment.

Secondly, it is not the kind of compensatory education which is after school. In other words, if you do not do the job right during the day, then you assume that a tired teacher who has not reached the pupil all day can take a tired kid who has not been reached all day and somehow in two hours after school undo what was done during the day. It does not take the remedial approach.

There are two kinds, three kinds, four kinds of compensatory education. We ought to recognize that there is something basically different in an approach that asks what kind of a school environment, what kind of a structure, what kind of program can we set up which assumes that the child can learn if you put him in a proper environment--one that is rich enough, responsive enough and warm enough where he can get attention at the time when he needs it? It is very different from these other approaches.

We met all kinds of resistance. Dr. Donovan at one meeting with the union committee said, I am violently opposed to the Effective School Program because I know it will work. If you set a school up that way, the kids will learn and then everybody will want this program and that kind of money just isn't in the cards. I am not going to set up one or three or ten or twenty of something that I know everybody is going to be dying for and we can't give them.

Then there was concern with space. In most of our big city school systems, we have very crowded conditions, especially in the ghetto areas. How do you take an elementary school that was built for 1,000 children and is now housing 1,800 children and say we are going to put a More Effective School in here; therefore, 800 children have to be selected to get out of this school just at the time when the school is being dramatically improved. So we proposed the idea of store-front schools. We even proposed another idea, and this went some years back. We proposed getting an aircraft carrier, some of the old mothball fleet, and converting it into a school. This was in the days when the civil rights struggle was over the issue of busing. We felt that instead of busing the kids to school, the carrier could go across the river and pick up kids from both sides. Busing is sort of low class and if the people had had the kids taken to school by bus, they might not have gone for it. But we proposed the carrier and feasibility studies were made. It turned out that it would not work, but we got church space, store space and other types of space. But that has been a continuing problem.

There was also a problem with civil rights groups. Civil rights groups originally supported the plan. As a matter of fact, if it were not for NAACP and the Urban League in New York City, the program never would have come into being. But at precisely the time when we were pushing for More Effective Schools, the push was for preparing schools under the Princeton Plan. There was a good deal of fear that if we made ghetto schools so good and so attractive, it would really take some of the steam out of the drive for integration.

At the present time there is another type of hostility toward this on the part of the black community groups--namely, the whole emphasis has now shifted. We hear, "We don't want more books. We don't want smaller class size. We don't want new schools. What is destroying our children is the racist attitude of our teachers who come into the ghetto every day to commit educational genocide. As a matter of fact, the smaller the class, the more effectively a teacher can destroy each child, and as long as we have teachers with attitudes like these, we don't want smaller classes." This is an increasing expression on the part of black community groups in New York City, which is part of the resistance to the program.

We also have resistance to the program from the old and still very large parent-teacher association in New York City, which has about 400,000 members, all of them in majority white areas. While they do not say so (they say they do not think the program works), they are really saying that if all the money goes to More Effective Schools that means that all the money is going to go first to the black schools and that means our parents, who were very active in increasing state support to schools, are going to have to wait five to fifteen years for our children to get reduced class size and so forth. In other words, part of the conflict of the affluent community with the poor community is on who gets priority. The affluent community is not at this point willing to buy the riot commission report. The affluent community, when pushed on a decision of where to spend money, is not yet willing to sit down and say, "Okay, we will take nothing for the next six to twelve years. Put it over there." These all form parts of the resistance.

What happened after that? In 1963 we were engaged in negotiations. We got a promise in the contract that the superintendent of schools would consult with us on Effective Schools. After that contract was signed, absolutely nothing happened. The superintendent was not interested. The board of education was not interested. Around April of the following year, Dr. Gross called us up one day and said, I have just been reading over your Effective School thing. I think it is great. I think we ought to sit down and work on it right away. This was at the time that Dr. Gross heard that the board was thinking of firing him.

The plan was never adopted on the basis of virtue. It was adopted on the basis of politics and to some extent now, there are great attempts to destroy it on the basis of politics. One of the sad things is the almost impossible quest to get honest educational answers to educational questions and somehow take this out of the power struggle.

Finally, they said that we could have 10 Effective Schools, but then we got a phone call which said the whole program was being held up. Why? The board of education could not tolerate calling these 10 schools "Effective Schools." It implied that all other schools were ineffective. We changed to More Effective Schools.

Funds were appropriated on the last day of school, June 30, which meant that the principals and teachers of the schools knew nothing of what they were coming back to. As a matter of fact, in order to get staff for the schools, the union had to send letters to 40,000 teachers at their homes over the summer asking for volunteer teachers to staff the schools because all teachers had already been assigned. The principals and teachers came in the first school day in September with twice the number of teachers they had been accustomed to seeing before and no notion of what the plan was, how personnel was to be used, where people were to go. For several weeks, people just sat around staring at each other and wondering what they were all supposed to do. We had a poor start. Since then, the board has done a number of things to try very quickly to dismantle the program.

We have always felt the program needed some central direction and coordination of what are now these 21 schools. The board keeps appointing people and getting rid of them. There is a "revolving door" type of leadership. For the entire program right now, they have one person with a secretary. The board president keeps circulating letters to the public and parent groups questioning whether the program is worth it, because he says it costs twice as much to run as any other elementary school in the city. In none of these letters does he talk about whether he holds these other elementary schools, some graduating 85 percent of their children as functional illiterates, as an ideal for comparison. During our most recent stoppage, continuation of the program and possible expansion were major issues.

How does this program work? If you read all the research, it shows that the staff in these schools are highly enthusiastic and that they believe that the children are learning and can learn; there is practically no staff turnover in these schools, less than in white middle-class areas and far less than in the ghetto areas. Another indicator is the extremely low utilization of sick leave, the lowest in the city, and the extremely high student attendance, the highest in the city. There is also the parent support. During the strike, there was a good deal of hostility in some communities with teachers and the union. Yet, 1,000 black parents, black predominantly, stormed City Hall and held rallies demonstrating for the program. One assistant principal who tried to organize a community boycott had six parents turn out for his boycott and 600 parents turn out in opposition. Such was the faith of the parents in that school.

We get some criticism from a report by a Mr. Fox to the effect that teachers with smaller classes are doing about the same as they were doing with much larger classes. If a teacher has only 16 students in class and is giving exactly the same lesson she gave last year to 35, then the program is not meaningful. I think that those who have made this comment overlook something, namely, that the lesson in a class with 35 children yelling and screaming and running around, with half the children finding it impossible to hear what the teacher says, may very well not sound like an inspiring message. It would be a lot more effective if the teacher could ask children more questions because there are only half of them and there is not the same noise level, the same tension, the same confusion. In other words, even if teachers have not yet--and I would agree--made use of the improvement in their positions to do some new and imaginative things, I would still say that there is definite improvement. Just walk into these schools and then walk into a room in a school four blocks away. In one you have groups of children sitting around the teacher in a very informal way, listening, talking and exchanging. A few blocks away the noise level is so fantastic that you wonder how anybody can stand it for an entire day.

We also hear the test story. We have now had three years of scores. Two of the years were very favorable. The last sets Mr. Fox says are not good. I cannot go into a detailed analysis except to raise certain questions. I would say that the most that Mr. Fox's scores show is that for the children in the fifth and sixth grades, namely, those who are not affected by this program in pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, first and second grade, those who are affected later, the program has very small output for the input. In other words, if you get a kid by third grade and if he already doubts his value, even doubling the expenditure may get you very little. So far the test scores seem to show that. Test scores in the younger grades are very good, but you know the phenomenon of the scores quoted here. In ghetto schools, as a result of all sorts of factors, retardation tends to increase. Therefore, it is not yet possible to know about those children who went through pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, first and second grade. The scores in second grade are terrific, but until we take a look at the third, fourth and fifth grades, where generally a lot of problems take place, it is much too early to stand and wave the flag and say, "We have the ultimate solution."

It may very well be that setting up More Effective Schools has really given the black child just the same amount of money as the white child is getting. It does not sound like that when you talk about a New York City School System where the average expenditure per child in the elementary schools is $600, but the More Effective Schools is $1200. But think of it in a slightly different way. Think that in the ghetto area schools you have a fantastic number of teachers who are step one, two, three, four of the salary schedule and earning $7,000, whereas in white middle-class schools you have many teachers who are earning $12,000, $13,000 and $14,000. Even though class sizes are a little smaller and supportive services, a little greater, with the actual amount of money you are spending on faculty in the white middle-class school, you may actually be spending twice as much now in the white middle-class schools as you are in the ghetto schools.

I want to turn just for a minute to the tremendous attack on any form of compensatory education. I find most such approaches very contradictory. For instance, they start by saying that we have to smash the bureaucratic system, because that is what many people claim. Then we say that because various agencies do not coordinate all their work, the school ought not only be handling school things, but ought to be handling everything else too. On one hand we want to smash the bureaucracy and on the other hand we say we ought to create a bigger one that performs many more functions. It is a romantic kind of reactionary philosophy that wants to go back to the good old days of smallness. The smallness of the thousands of school systems managing themselves was never really able to provide for the educational needs of the past and will not be able to provide for them in the future.

We have very simple concepts which are now emerging, concepts like accountability. This means that if a teacher's class does not make progress in a year, then that teacher should be held accountable and should be dismissed. If a doctor has a patient and the patient dies, we do not get rid of the doctor. We do not even get rid of the doctor if five in a row die. We take a look at the patient who died. We diagnose what he died of. We then find out what the doctor administered, and even though many of his patients die, we may say that he performed brilliantly. On the other hand, medical experts can take a look at a doctor's treatment of some patients who live even though the medical treatment was rather incompetent. Would you rate lawyers on the occasion lost? In every case there is a lawyer on the winning side and a lawyer on the losing side.

The problem of education is that we do not have what is a comparable development of a body of knowledge in education such as we have in fields like law and medicine. We do not have a body of knowledge whereby a committee of experts will come in and say, "Was this the process? The teaching that this teacher did was excellent or average or horrible." We tend to know the few exceptional cases of brilliance. It is also fairly easy to detect the cases at the other extreme of gross incompetence, but most people are in the middle. How can we talk about getting rid of all the bad guys and replacing them with others who will have the right attitudes, accountability and such? Where do we get let us say 20,000 or 30,000 new teachers to replace the ones who are going to be held accountable to go out of New York City. Where are you going to find them in Detroit? We have here a romantic defeatist philosophy. We have got to start by understanding that we are getting an unfortunate dialogue. The parent is saying to the teacher, "It's your fault." The teacher is saying to the parents and family, "It's your fault." It is time we turned to the teachers and said, "Look. Be realistic. These are the children you have and these are their parents. These are their traditions. You are not going to exchange these children for other children. These are the ones you are going to have to teach."

It is also about time that parents and communities realize that we do not have in our country 10, 30, 60 thousand or a million teachers with good attitudes, who are terrific at reaching children, at getting rid of American middle-class culture and replacing it with something brand new that we cannot even quite define as yet. By merely attacking every practical proposal which can be brought into existence and talking about something that is absolutely impossible, we are on the verge of destroying the public school system.

Then too, under this model of the private school system where every child gets $600 and goes any place he wants, what would happen? What kind of commercial system would you have where people's money would be taken away. The first thing you would have to set up is a governmental agency to make sure that the parents did not get cheated. Then you would have your bureaucracy again. You would have standards. If you have ever seen businesses that were based on education, like the summer camping business, you see how parents can get taken.

Consider also the notion that if you have a lot of small school systems, they are going to be innovative and they are going to be different. We have many small school systems throughout the United States. Just put a blindfold on and go a thousand miles in any direction. You will not know if you are in New York or Michigan, Illinois or California. Small school systems do not have the money, the brainpower or the manpower to innovate. All they can do is block-buy the commercial stuff that everybody else puts out. It takes largeness to innovate. I think we ought to stop this phony business of thinking we can go back to pre-Revolutionary War days and the ideal little school, where just because a few people went down to a meeting every year and raised their hands, everything was wonderful. We ought to recognize that the problems we face today come from the myth of local control over the last century.